66-1
17

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Princeton, N. J.

Case,
Shelf,
Book,
Division
Section
No.

SCC
1626
c. 1

A

VINDICATION

OF

CHRIST'S DIVINITY:

BEING A

DEFENSE

OF SOME

QUERIES,

RELATING TO

Dr. *CLARKE's*

SCHEME of the H. TRINITY,

IN ANSWER TO A

CLERGY-MAN in the COUNTRY.

By *DANIEL WATERLAND*, D.D.
MASTER of *Magdalen-College*, in CAMBRIDGE,
and CHAPLAIN in Ordinary to His *MAJESTY*.

Ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς ὃν σὺ διώκεις· σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν, Act. IX. 5.

CAMBRIDGE:
Printed for CORN. CROWNFIELD, Printer to the *University:* And are to be Sold by JAMES KNAPTON, and ROBERT KNAPLOCK, Booksellers in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard, *LONDON*. MDCCXIX.

you ask *Tertullian*, how Father and Son can be reputed *one God*. He tells you in the Chapter before, and in that very Passage which the Doctor quotes, that it is by *Unity of Substance* and *Original Unity of Authority*, and *Unity of Godhead*, are, with *Tertullian*, distinct Things; however you may please to confound Them. God and his Angels have, according to Him, *one Authority*, but He does not therefore say, that the Angels are *Gods*, or that, if They were, there would still be but *one God*.

Athanasius makes use of the same *Similitude* for the same purpose with *Tertullian*, to illustrate the Unity of *Authority* and Power common to Father and Son, and the Unity of *Godhead*. It was the *Government divine*, which He undertook, in some meaning, to illustrate, by That Comparison of a Ring and his *Son*, which however would argue an *Equality of Nature*, contrary to your Tenets! But as to Unity of *Godhead*, He resolves it into other Principles, the very same with *Ter-*

[illegible]

[illegible]

THE PREFACE.

THE following Queries *were drawn up, a few Years ago, at the Requeſt of Friends; when I had not the leaſt apprehenſion of their ever appearing in Print, as might be gueſs'd from the negligence of the Style and Compoſition. The Occaſion of them was this. A Clergyman in the Country, well eſteem'd in the Neighbourhood where He lived, had unhappily fallen in with Dr.* Clarke's *Notions of the* Trinity; *and began to eſpouſe them in a more open and unguarded manner than the Doctor Himſelf had done. This gave ſome uneaſineſs to the Clergy in thoſe Parts, who could not but be deeply concern'd to find a fundamental Article of Religion called in Queſtion; and that too by one of their own Order, and whom They had a true Concern and Value for. It was preſumed, that a ſincere and ingenuous Man*

(*as He appeared to be*) *might, upon proper Application, be inclinable to alter his Opinion: And that the moſt probable way to bring Him to a Senſe of his miſtake, was to put Him to defend it, ſo long till He might perhaps ſee reaſon to believe that it was not defenſible. With theſe Thoughts, I was prevailed upon to draw up a few* Queries (*the ſame that appear now, excepting only ſome ſlight* verbal *Alterations*) *and when I had done, gave them to a common Friend to convey to Him. I was the more inclined to it, for my own Inſtruction and Improvement, in ſo momentous and important an Article: Beſides, that I had long been of Opinion, that no method could be more proper for the training up one's Mind to a true and ſound Judgment of Things, than that of private Conference in Writing; exchanging Papers, making Anſwers, Replies, and Rejoinders, till an Argument ſhould be exhauſted on both Sides, and a Controverſy at length brought to a Point. In that private way* (*if it can be private*) *a Man writes with Eaſineſs and Freedom; is in no pain about any innocent Slips or Miſtakes; is under little or no Temptation to perſiſt obſtinately in an Error* (*the Bane of all* publick *Controverſy*) *but concern'd only to find out the Truth, which* (*on what Side ſoever it appears*) *is always* Victory *to every honeſt Mind.*

I had

I had not long gone on with my Correſpondent, before I found all my Meaſures broken, and my Hopes intirely fruſtrated. He had ſent Me, in Manuſcript, *an* Anſwer *to my* Queries; *which Anſwer I received and read with due Care; promis'd Him immediately a Reply; and ſoon after prepared and finiſh'd it, and convey'd it ſafe to his Hands. Then it was, and not till then, that He diſcovered to Me what He had been doing; ſignifying, by Letter, how He had been over perſwaded to commit his* Anſwer, *with my* Queries, *to the Preſs; that They had been there ſome time, and could not now be recalled; that I muſt follow Him thither, if I intended any thing farther; and muſt adapt my* publick Defenſe *to his* publick Anſwer, *now altered and improved, from what it had been in the* Manuſcript *which had been ſent me. This News ſurprized Me a little at the firſt; and ſorry I was to find my Correſpondent ſo extremely deſirous of inſtructing Others, inſtead of taking the moſt prudent and conſiderate Method of informing Himſelf. As He had left Me no Choice, but either to follow Him to the Preſs, or to deſiſt, I choſe what I thought moſt proper at that Time; leaving Him to inſtruct the* Publick *as He pleaſed, deſigning my Self to keep out of* Publick *Controverſy; or, at leaſt, not deſigning the Contrary. But, at length, conſidering that Copies of my* Defenſe *were got abroad into ſeveral Hands, and*

might perhaps, some time or other, steal into the Press without my Knowledge; and considering farther that this Controversy now began to grow Warm, and that it became every honest Man, according to the Measure of his Abilities, to bear his Testimony in so good a Cause; I thought it best to revise my Papers, to give them my last Hand, and to send Them abroad into the World; where They must stand or fall (as I desire They should) according as They are found to have more or less Truth or Weight in Them.

Dr. Clarke *has lately publish'd a Second Edition of his* Scripture-Doctrine: *Where, I perceive, He has made several Additions and Alterations, but has neither* retracted, *nor* defended *those Parts, which Mr.* Nelson's *learned Friend had judiciously replied to, in his* True Scripture-Doctrine continu'd. *I hope, impartial Readers will take care to read One along with the Other.*

One thing I must observe, for the Doctor's Honour, that in his new Edition He has left out these Words of his former Introduction: "*'Tis plain that every Person may reasonably agree to such* Forms, *whenever He can* "*in any Sense at all reconcile them with* "*Scripture. I hope, none hereafter will pretend to make use of the Doctor's* Authority, *for* subscribing *to* Forms *which They believe*

not

not according to the true *and* proper *Senſe of the Words, and the* known *intent of the* Impoſers, *and* Compilers. *Such* Prevarication *is in it ſelf a bad Thing, and would, in Time, have a very ill Influence on the* Morals *of a Nation. If either* State-Oaths *on one Hand, or* Church-Subſcriptions *on the Other, once come to be made light of; and* Subtilties *be invented to defend or palliate ſuch groſs* Inſincerity; *we may bid farewell to* Principles, *and* Religion *will be little elſe but diſguis'd* Atheiſm.

The learned Doctor, in his Introduction, has inſerted, by way of Note, a long Quotation out of Mr. Nelſon's Life *of Biſhop* Bull. *He can hardly be preſumed to intend any* Parallel *between Biſhop* Bull's *Caſe and his* own: *And yet Readers may be apt ſo to take it, ſince the Doctor has not guarded againſt it, and ſince otherwiſe it will not be eaſy to make out the pertinence of it. The Doctor has undoubtedly ſome meaning in it, tho' I will not preſume to gueſs what. He* * *obſerves,* "*That there is an exact account* "*given, what Method that learned Writer* "(Biſhop Bull) *took to explain the Doctrine* "*of* Juſtification (*viz. the* very ſame *and* only "*Method which ought to be taken in explain-*"*ing all other Doctrines whatſoever*) *how*

* Introduct. p. 25, 26.

" *zealouſly He was accuſed by many* Syſtema-
" tical *Divines, as departing from the Do-*
" *ctrine and Articles of the Church, in what*
" *He had done*; *how* learnedly *and* effectually
" *He defended Himſelf againſt* all *his* Adver-
" ſaries; *and how* ſucceſsful *at length his Ex-*
" *plication was, it being after ſome Years*
" *almoſt* univerſally *received. This account*
is true, but defective; *and may want a Sup-*
plement for the Benefit of common Readers,
who may wiſh to know, what that excellent
Method of Biſhop Bull's *was, by means of*
which his Explication proved ſo ſucceſsful,
and came at length to be almoſt univerſally
received. It was as follows.

1. *In the firſt place, his way was to ex-*
amine carefully into Scripture, *more than into*
the Nature *and* Reaſon *of the Thing abſtract-*
edly conſider'd. He pitch'd upon ſuch Texts
as were pertinent, *and* cloſe *to the Point*;
did not chuſe Them according to the Sound
only, but their real *Senſe*; *which He ex-*
plain'd juſtly *and* naturally, *without any* wreſt-
ing *or* ſtraining. *He neither* neglected *nor* diſ-
ſembled *the utmoſt force of any Texts which*
ſeem'd to make againſt Him; *but propoſed them*
fairly, *and anſwer'd them* ſolidly; *without*
any artificial Eluſions, *or any* ſubtile *or* ſur-
prizing *Gloſſes.*

2. *In*

2. *In the next place, however cogent and forcible his reasonings from Scripture appeared to be, yet He* modestly *declined being* confident *of them, unless He could find them likewise* supported *by the general Verdict of the* primitive *Church*; *for which He always expressed a most* religious *Regard and Veneration: believing it easier for Himself to err in* interpreting *Scripture, than for the* universal *Church to have erred from the Beginning. To pass by many other Instances of his* sincere *and* great *Regard to* Antiquity, *I shall here mention one only. He* * *tells Dr.* Tully, *in the most serious and solemn manner imaginable, that if there could but be found any one Proposition, that He had maintain'd in all his* Harmony, *repugnant to the Doctrine of the* Catholick *and* Primitive *Church, He would immediately give up the Cause, sit down contentedly under the reproach of a* Noveliſt, *openly* retract *his* Error *or* Hereſy, *make a solemn* Recantation *in the Face of the Christian World, and bind Himself to perpetual silence ever after. He knew very well what He said; being able to show, by an Historical Deduction, that his Doctrine had been the constant Doctrine of the Church of Christ,* † *down to the Days of* Calvin, *in the Sixteen Century.*

* Bull. Apolog. Contr. Tull. p. 7.
† Bull. Apol. Contr. Tull. p. 50, 51.

3. *Besides this, He demonstrated, very clearly, that the most antient and valuable* Confessions *of the* Reformed Churches *Abroad were intirely in his Sentiments. He examin'd them with great Care and Exactness, and answer'd the contrary Pretences largely and solidly.*

4. *To compleat All, He vindicated his Doctrine farther, from the concurring Sentiments of our own most early, and most judicious* Reformers: *As also from the* Articles, Catechism, Liturgy, *and* Homilies *of the Church of* England: *And this with great accuracy and strength of Reason, without the mean Arts of* Equivocation *or* Sophistry.

5. *I may add, fifthly, that his manner of Writing was the most* convincing, *and most* ingaging *imaginable:* Acute, strong, *and* nervous; learned *throughout*; *and* sincere *to a scrupulous Exactness, without* artificial *Colours or studied* Disguises, *which He utterly abhorr'd. The* good *and* great *Man breaths in every Line: A Reader, after a few Pages, may be tempted almost to throw off his Guard, and to resign Himself implicitely into so safe Hands. A Man thus qualified and accomplish'd, having* true *Judgment to take the* right Side *of a Question*; *and* Learning, Ability, *and* Integrity *to set it off to the greatest Advantage, could not fail of Success*; *especially*

consider-

conſidering that the moſt judicious and learned of our Clergy, and Thoſe beſt affected to the Church of England (*ſuch as Dr.* Hammond, *&c.*) *had been in the ſame Sentiments before; and Biſhop* Bull's *bittereſt Adverſaries were moſtly* Syſtematical *Men* (*properly ſo called*) *and ſuch as had been bred up* (*during the* great Rebellion) *in the* Predeſtinarian *and* Antinomian *Tenets, as Mr.* * Nelſon *obſerves. There was another Circumſtance which Mr.* Nelſon *alſo takes* † *notice of; namely, his writing in* Latin: *Which ſhowed his thorough Judgment of Men and Things. He would not write to the* Vulgar *and* Unlearned (*which is beginning at the wrong end, and doing nothing*) *but to the* Learned *and* Judicious; *knowing it to be the ſureſt and the ſhorteſt way; and that, if the Point be gain'd with* Them, *the reſt come in of Courſe; if not, all is to no purpoſe. This became a Man, who had a* Cauſe *that He could* truſt to; *and confided only in the* ſtrength *of his* Reaſons. *By ſuch* laudable *and* ingenuous *Methods, that excellent Man prevailed over his* Adverſaries; Truth *over* Error, Antiquity *over* Novelty, *the Church of Chriſt over* Calvin *and his Diſciples. If any Man elſe has ſuch a* Cauſe *to defend as Biſhop* Bull *had, and is able to manage it in ſuch a Method, by ſhowing that it ſtands upon the*

* Nelſon's *Life of* Bull, *pag.* 98.
† Nelſon's *Life of* Bull, *pag.* 94.

ſame

ſame immoveable Foundations of Scripture *and* Antiquity, *confirm'd by the concurring Senſe of the* judicious *part of Mankind*; *then He need not doubt but it will prevail and proſper, in any* Proteſtant *Country, as* univerſally *as the other did. But if ſeveral of thoſe Circumſtances, or the moſt* conſiderable *of them, be wanting*; *or if Circumſtances be contrary, then it is as* vain *to expect the like* Succeſs, *as it is to expect* Miracles. *It muſt not be forgot, that the ſame good and great* Prelate, *afterwards, by the ſame* fair *and* honourable *Methods, the ſame ſtrength of Reaſon and profound Learning, gain'd as compleat a Victory over the* Arians, *in regard to the Queſtion about the Faith of the* Ante-Nicene *Fathers: And his* Determination, *in that particular, was, and ſtill is, among Men of the greateſt Learning and Judgment, as* univerſally *ſubmitted to as the other. His admirable Treatiſe* (*by which* He being dead yet ſpeaketh) *remains* unanſwer'd *to this Day*; *and will abide* Victorious *to the End. But enough of this.*

I am obliged to ſay ſomething in Defence of my general Title. (A Vindication of Chriſt's Divinity) *becauſe, I ſaid, Mr.* Potter, *ſince deceas'd, was rebuked by an* * *Anonymous Hand for ſuch a* Title. *The pretence is, that our*

* *Apology for Dr* Clarke *Pref.*

Adver-

Adversaries do not disown Christ's Divinity, *as the* Title *insinuates* But *to what purpose is it for Them to contend about a* Name, *when They give up the* Thing. *It looks too like* Mockery (*though They are far from intending it*) *and cannot but remind us of,* Hail King of the Jews. *No body ever speaks of the* Divinity *of* Moses, *or of* Magistrates, *or of* Angels, *though called* Gods *in Scripture. If Christ be* God, *in the* relative *Sense only, why should we speak of His* Divinity, *more than of the Other? The Christian Church has all along used the word* Divinity, *in the strict and proper Sense: If we must change the* Idea, *let us change the* Name *too*; *and talk no more of Christ's* Divinity, *but of his* Mediatorship *only, or at most,* Kingship. *This will be the way to prevent* Equivocation, *keep up propriety of Language, and shut out false* Ideas. *I know no* Divinity, *but such as I have defended: The other, falsly so called, is* really *none. So much for the* Title.

In the Work *it self, I have endeavor'd to unravel* Sophistry, *detect* Fallacies, *and take off* Disguises, *in order to set the Controversy upon a* clear Foot; *allowing only for the* Mysteriousness *of the Subject. The Gentlemen of the* New way *have hitherto kept pretty much in* generals, *and avoided coming to the pinch of the Question. If they please to speak to the Point, and put the Cause upon*

on a short Issue, as may easily be done, that is all that is desir'd. I doubt not but all Attempts of that kind will end (as they have ever done) in the clearing up of the Truth, the Disappointment of its Opposers, the Joy of good Men, and the Honour of our Blessed Lord; *whose* Divinity *has been the Rock of Offence to the* Disputers of this World, *now for* 1600 *Years*; *always attack'd by some or other, in every Age, and always Triumphant.* To Him, with the Father, and the Holy Ghost, Three Persons of the same divine Power, Substance, and Perfections, be all Honour and Glory, in all Churches of the Saints, now and for evermore.

THE

THE CONTENTS.

Compare the following TEXTS.

I am the Lord, and there is none else; There is no God besides me, *Isa.* 45. 5.	The Word was God, *Joh.* 1. 1.
Is there a God besides me? Yea, there is no God, I know not any, *Isa.* 44. 8.	Thy Throne, O God, *Heb.* 1. 8
I am God and there is none like me; Before me there was no God form'd, neither shall there be after me, *Isa.* 46. 9.	Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever, *Rom.* 9. 5.
	Who being in the Form of God *Phil.* 2. 6.
	Who being the Brightness of his Glory, and the express Image of his Person. *Heb.* 1. 3.

QUERY I.

Whether all other Beings, besides the one Supreme God, be not excluded by the Texts of Isaiah *(to which many more might be added) and consequently, whether Christ can be God at all, unless he be the same with the Supreme God? p.* 2.

QUERY II.

Whether the Texts of the New Testament (in the second Column) do not show that He (Christ) *is not excluded, and therefore must be the same God? p.* 6.

QUERY III.

Whether the Word (God) *in Scripture, can reasonably be suppos'd to carry an* ambiguous *meaning, or be us'd in a dif-*

a different *Senſe*, when applied to the Father and Son, *in the ſame Scripture, and even in the ſame verſe*? *(See* Joh. 1. 1.*)* *p.* 47.

QUERY IV.

Whether, ſuppoſing the Scripture-Notion of God to be no more than that of the Author and Governor of the Univerſe, *or whatever it be, the admitting of Another to be* Author and Governor of the Univerſe, *be not admitting* another God; *contrary to the Texts before cited from* Iſaiah; *and alſo to* Iſa. 42. 8.——48. 11. *where he declares,* He will not give his Glory to Another? *p.* 73.

QUERY V.

Whether Dr. Clarke's *pretence, that the* Authority *of Father and Son being* One, *tho' they are two diſtinct Beings, makes them not to be two Gods,* As a King upon the Throne and his Son adminiſtring the Father's Government, are not two Kings; *be not trifling and inconſiſtent*? For, *if the King's Son be not a King, he cannot truly be called* King; *if he is, then there are* two Kings. So, *if the Son be not* God *in the Scripture-Notion of* God, *he cannot* truly *be called* God; *and then how is the Doctor conſiſtent with Scripture, or with Himſelf? But if the Son be* truly God, *there are* two Gods *upon the Doctor's Hypotheſis, as plainly as that* one *and* one *are* two: *and ſo all the Texts of* Iſaiah *cited above, beſides others, ſtand full and clear againſt the Doctor's Notion. p.* 79.

TEXTS, proving an Unity of divine Attributes in Father and Son, applied.

To the one God.	*To the Son.*
Thou, even Thou only knoweſt the Hearts of all	He knew all Men &c. *John* 2. 24. Thou knoweſt all

the

the Children of Men, 1. *Kings* 8. 39.

I the Lord search the Heart; I try the Reins, *Jer.* 17. 10.

I am the first, and I am the last; and besides me there is no God, *Isa.* 44. 6.

I am A and Ω, the beginning and the end, *Rev.* 1. 8.

King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, 1. *Tim.* 6. 15.

The mighty God, *Isa.* 10. 21.

Lord over all, *Rom.* 10. 12.

Things, *Joh.* 16. 30. which knowest the Hearts of all Men, *Acts* 1. 24.

I am he that searcheth the Reins and the Heart, *Rev.* 2. 3.

I am the first, and I am the last, *Rev.* 1. 17.

I am A and Ω, the beginning and the end, *Rev.* 22. 13.

Lord of Lords, and King of Kings, *Rev.* 17. 14—19. 16.

The mighty God, *Is.* 9. 6.

He is Lord of all, *Acts* 10. 36.

Over all God blessed, &c. *Rom.* 9. 5.

QUERY VI.

Whether the same Characteristicks, especially such eminent ones, can reasonably be understood of two distinct Beings, and of one Infinite and Independent, the other Dependent and Finite? p. 89.

QUERY VII.

Whether the Father's Omniscience *and* Eternity *are not one and the same with the Son's being alike describ'd, and in the same phrases?* p. 100.

QUERY VIII.

Whether Eternity *does not imply* necessary Existence *of the Son; which is inconsistent with the Doctor's Scheme? And whether the* * *Doctor hath not made an* elusive,

* Reply. p. 227.

equivo-

equivocating *Answer to the Objection, since the Son may be a* necessary Emanation *from the* Father, *by the* Will *and* Power *of the Father, without any Contradiction?* Will *is one thing, and* Arbitrary *Will another.* p. 121.

QUERY IX.

Whether the divine Attributes, Omniscience, Ubiquity, &c. *those individual Attributes can be communicated without the divine Essence, from which they are inseparable?* p. 164.

QUERY X.

Whether, if they (the Attributes belonging to the Son) *be not* Individually *the same, they can be any thing more than faint Resemblances of them, differing from them as* Finite *from* Infinite; *and then in what Sense, or with what Truth can the Doctor pretend that* * all divine Powers, except absolute Supremacy and Independency, *are communicated to the Son? And whether every Being, besides the one Supreme Being, must not necessarily be a* Creature *and* Finite; *and whether* all divine Powers *can be communicated to a Creature,* Infinite *Perfection to a* Finite *Being?* p. 174.

QUERY XI.

Whether if the Doctor means by divine Powers, Powers given by God (in the same Sense as Angelical Powers are divine *Powers) only in a higher Degree than are given to other Beings; it be not equivocating and saying nothing: Nothing that can come up to the Sense of those Texts before cited, † or to these following?* p. 181.

Applied.

To the one God.	*To God the Son.*
Thou, even Thou, art Lord alone; Thou hast	All things were made by him, *Joh.* 1. 3. By him

* Scripture Doctr. p. 298.

† Query 6, p. 89,

were

made Heaven, the Heaven of Heavens with all their Hoſt, the Earth, and all things that are therein &c. *Neh.* 9. 6.

In the Beginning, God Created the Heavens and the Earth, *Gen.* 1. 1.

were all things Created; He is before all things and by him all things Conſiſt, *Coloſ.* 1. 16. 17.

Thou, Lord, in the Beginning, haſt laid the Foundation of the Earth; and the Heavens are the Work of thy Hands, *Heb.* 1. 10.

QUERY XII.

Whether the Creator of all Things was not himſelf Uncreated; and therefore could not be ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, *made out of nothing?* p. 194.

QUERY XIII.

Whether there can be any Middle between being made out of nothing, and out of ſomething; that is, between being out of nothing, and out of the Father's Subſtance; between being eſſentially God, *and being* a Creature? *Whether, conſequently, the Son muſt not be either* eſſentially God, *or elſe* a Creature? p. 202.

QUERY XIV.

Whether Dr. Clarke, *who every where denies the Conſubſtantiality of the Son as abſurd and contradictory, does not, of Conſequence, affirm the Son to be a Creature* ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, *and ſo fall under his own cenſure, and is Self-condemn'd?* p. 212.

QUERY XV.

Whether he alſo muſt not, of Conſequence, affirm of the Son, that there was a time when he was not, *ſince* God *muſt exiſt before the* Creature; *and therefore is again Self-condemn'd* (See prop. 16. Scrip. Doctr.)

And whether he does not equivocate in saying * *elsewhere that the second Person has been* always *with the first; and that there has been* no time, *when he was not so: And lastly, whether it be not a vain and weak attempt to pretend to any middle way between the* Orthodox *and the* Arians; *or to carry the Son's Divinity the least higher than they did, without taking in the Consubstantiality?* p. 214.

Divine Worship due

To the one God.	*To Christ.*
Thou shalt have no other Gods before me, *Exod.* 20. 3.	They worship'd him, *Luk.* 24. 25.
Thou shalt Worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve, *Matt.* 4. 10.	Let all the Angels of God worship him, *Heb.* 1. 6.
	That all Men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father, *Joh.* 5. 23.

QUERY XVI.

Whether by these (of the first Column) *and the like Texts, Adoration and Worship be not so appropriated to the one God, as to belong to him only?* p. 229.

QUERY XVII.

Whether, notwithstanding, Worship and Adoration be not equally due to Christ; and consequently, whether it must not follow that he is the one God, and not (as the Arians *suppose) a distinct inferior Being?* p. 252.

QUERY XVIII.

Whether Worship and Adoration, both from Men and Angels, was not due to him, long before the Commencing of his

* Script. Doctr. p. 438.

Medi-

Mediatorial Kingdom, *as he was their Creator and Preserver (See Col. 1. 16, 17.) And whether* that *be not the same Title to Adoration which God the Father hath, as Author and Governor of the Universe, upon the Doctor's own Principles?* p. 267.

QUERY XIX.

Whether the Doctor hath not given a very partial Account of Joh. 5. 23. *founding the Honour due to the Son, on this only, that* the Father hath committed all Judgment to the Son; *when the true Reason assign'd by our Saviour, and illustrated by several Instances, is, that the Son doth the same things that the Father doth, hath the same Power and Authority of doing what he will; and therefore has a Title to as great Honour, Reverence, and Regard, as the Father himself hath? And it is no Objection to this, that the Son is there said to do* nothing of himself, *or to have all given Him by the Father; since it is own'd that the Father is the Fountain of all, from whom the Son derives, in an ineffable manner, his Essence and Powers, so as to be one with him.* p. 278.

QUERY. XX.

Whether the Doctor need have cited 300 *Texts, wide of the purpose, to prove what no Body denies, namely* a Subordination, *in some Sense, of the* Son *to the Father; could He have found but one plain Text against his* Eternity *or* Consubstantiality, *the points in Question?* p. 298.

QUERY XXI.

Whether he be not forc'd to supply his want of Scripture-proof by very strain'd and remote Inferences, and very uncertain Reasonings from the Nature of a thing, confessedly Obscure and above Comprehension; and yet not more so than God's Eternity, Ubiquity, Prescience, *or other Attributes, which yet we are obliged to acknowledge for certain Truths?* p. 303.

QUERY XXII.

Whether his (the Doctors) *whole performance, whenever He differs from us, be any thing more than a Repetition of this Assertion, that* Being *and* Person *are the same, or that there is no* Medium *between* Tritheism *and* Sabellianism? *which is removing the Cause from Scripture to natural Reason; not very Consistently with the Title of his Book.* p. 326.

QUERY XXIII.

Whether the Doctor's Notion of the Trinity be more clear and intelligible than the other?

The Difficulty in the Conception of the Trinity is, how Three Persons can be One God.

Does the Doctor deny that every One of the Persons, singly, is God? No: Does he deny that God is One? No: how then are Three One

Does one and the same Authority, exercised by all, make them one, numerically or individually one and the same God? That is hard to conceive how three distinct Beings, according to the Doctor's Scheme, can be individually one God, that is, three Persons one Person.

If therefore one God necessarily signifies but one Person, the Consequence is irresistible; either that the Father is that one Person, and none else, which is downright Sabellianism; *or that the three Persons are three Gods.*

Thus the Doctor's Scheme is liable to the same Difficulties with the other.

There is indeed one easy way of coming off, and that is, by saying that the Son and Holy Spirit are neither of them God, in the Scripture-sense of the Word. But this is cutting the Knot, instead of untying it; and is in effect to say, they are not set forth as divine Persons in Scripture.

Does the Communication of divine Powers and Attributes from Father, to Son and Holy Spirit, make them one God, the Divinity of the two latter being the Father's Divinity?

Divinity? Yet the same difficulty recurs: For either the Son and Holy-Ghost have distinct Attributes, and a distinct Divinity of their own, or they have not: If they have, they are (upon the Doctor's Principles) distinct Gods from the Father, and as much as Finite from Infinite, Creature from Creator; and then how are they one? If they have not, then, since they have no other Divinity, but that individual Divinity and those Attributes which are inseparable from the Father's Essence, they can have no distinct Essence from the Father's; and so (according to the Doctor) will be one and the same Person, that is, will be Names only.

Q. *Whether this be not as unintelligible as the Orthodox Notion of the Trinity, and liable to the like Difficulties: A communication of Divine Powers and Attributes, without the Substance, being as hard to conceive, nay, much harder than a communication of Both together?* p. 343.

QUERY XXIV.

Whether Gal. 4. 8. *may not be enough to determine the dispute betwixt us; since it obliged the Doctor to confess that Christ is* * by Nature truly God, as truly as Man is by Nature truly Man.

He equivocates, there, indeed, as Usual. For, he will have it to signify, that Christ is God by Nature, only as having by that Nature which he derives from the Father, true Divine Power and Dominion: that is, he is truly God by Nature, as having a Nature distinct from and inferior to God's, wanting † the most Essential Character of God, *Self-existence. What is this but trifling with Words, and playing fast and loose?* p. 370.

QUERY XXV.

Whether it be not clear from all the genuine remains of Antiquity, that the Catholick Church before the Council of Nice, *and even from the beginning, did believe the Eternity and Consubstantiality of the Son; if either the*

* Reply p. 81. † Reply p. 92.

eldeſt Creeds, as interpreted by thoſe that recite them; or the Teſtimonies of the earlieſt Writers, or the publick Cenſures paſs'd upon Hereticks, or particular paſſages of the Antienteſt Fathers, can amount to a proof of a thing of this Nature? p. 378.

QUERY XXVI.

Whether the Doctor did not equivocate or prevaricate ſtrangely in ſaying * The Generality of Writers before the Council of Nice, were, in the whole, clearly on his ſide: *when it is manifeſt, they were, in the general, no farther on his ſide, than the allowing a* Subordination *amounts to; no further than our own Church is on his ſide, while in the main points of difference, the* Eternity *and* Conſubſtantiality, *they are clearly againſt him? That is, they were on his ſide, ſo far as we acknowledge him to be right, but no farther.* p. 389.

QUERY XXVII.

Whether the Learned Doctor may not reaſonably be ſuppoſ'd to ſay, the Fathers are on his ſide *with the ſame Meaning and Reſerve as he pretends our* Church-Forms *to favour him; that is, provided he may interpret as he pleaſes, and make them ſpeak his Senſe, however Contradictory to their own: And whether the true Reaſon why he does not care to admit the Teſtimonies of the Fathers as* Proofs, *may not be, becauſe* they are againſt him? p. 422.

QUERY XXVIII.

Whether it be at all probable, that the primitive Church ſhould miſtake in ſo material a Point as this is; or that the whole Stream of Chriſtian Writers ſhould miſtake in telling us what the Senſe of the Church was; and whether ſuch a Cloud of Witneſſes can be ſet aſide without weakening the only Proof we have of the Canon of Scripture, *and the Integrity of the Sacred Text?* p. 456.

* Anſwer to Dr. *Wells* pag. 28.

QUERY XXIX.

Whether private Reasoning, in a matter above our Comprehension, be a safer Rule to go by, than the general Sense and Judgment of the primitive Church, in the first 300 *Years; or, supposing it doubtful what the Sense of the Church was within that time, whether what was determin'd by a Council of* 300 *Bishops soon after, with the greatest Care and Deliberation, and has satisfied Men of the greatest Sense, Piety and Learning, all over the Christian World, for* 1400 *Years since, may not satisfy wise and good Men now?* p. 460.

QUERY XXX.

Whether, supposing the Case doubtful, it be not a wise Man's part to take the safer Side; rather to think too highly, than too meanly of our Blessed Saviour; rather to pay a modest deference to the Judgment of the Antient and Modern Church, than to lean to one's own Understanding? p. 475.

QUERY XXXI.

Whether any thing less than clear and evident Demonstration, *on the side of* Arianism, *ought to move a wise and good Man, against so great Appearances of Truth, on the side of* Orthodoxy, *from* Scripture, Reason, *and* Antiquity: *And whether we may not wait long before we find such* Demonstration? p. 481.

ERRATA.

ERRATA.

Pag.	Lin.	Read.
10	1 not.	*Irenæus.*
17	15 not.	ἠμπίχετο.
27	1	*Gregories.*
30	4 not.	p. 123. Ox. Ed.
	ult. not.	Patient.
46	1	perplex.
54	5 not.	*Credendus.*
59	21	expreſſly.
86	4 not.	γενητῶν
128	16	dele comma after *Marius.*
183	8 not.	τῶν.
293	11	elaborately
329	2 not.	ἀχίας
363	24	τὴν
430	7 not.	ἀπάντων
431	not.	εἰκὼν

A

DEFENSE

OF SOME

QUERIES

RELATING TO

Dr. *CLARKE*'s

SCHEME of the H. TRINITY:

IN ANSWER TO A

CLERGY-MAN in the COUNTRY.

Compare the following TEXTS.

I am the Lord, and there is none elſe; There is no God beſides me, Iſa. 45. 5.

Is there a God beſides me? Yea, There is no God, I know not any, Iſ. 44. 8.

I am God and there is none like me; Before me there was no God form'd, neither ſhall there be after me, Iſ. 46. 9.

The Word was God, Joh. 1. 1.

Thy Throne, O God, Heb. 1. 8.

Chriſt came, who is over all God bleſſed for ever, Rom. 9. 5.

Who being in the Form of God, Phil. 2. 6.

Who being the Brightneſs of his Glory, and the expreſs Image of his Perſon, Heb. 1. 3.

Query I.

Whether all other Beings, beſides the one Supreme God, be not excluded by the Texts of Iſaiah, (*to which many more might be added*) *and conſequently, whether Chriſt can be God at all, unleſs He be the ſame with the Supreme God?*

THE Sum of your Anſwer to this Query, is, that *the Texts cited from* Iſaiah, *in the firſt Column, are ſpoken of* one Perſon only, p. 34. *The Perſon of the Father*, p. 39. *And therefore all other Perſons, or Beings* (which you make equivalent) *how divine ſoever, are neceſſarily excluded; and by Conſequence, our Lord Jeſus Chriſt is as much excluded from being* the one Supreme God, *as from being the Perſon of the Father*, p. 40.

You ſpend ſome Pages, in endeavouring to ſhow, that the *Perſon* of the Father *only* is the Supreme God; and that the Perſon of the Son is not Supreme God. But what does this ſignify, except it be to lead your Reader off from the Point which it concern'd you to ſpeak to? Inſtead of anſwering the Difficulty propos'd, which was the part of a Reſpondent, you chuſe to ſlip it over, and endeavor to put me upon the Defenſive; which is by no means Fair. Your Buſineſs was to ward off the Conſequence which I had preſs'd you with, namely, this: That if the Son be at all excluded by thoſe Texts

Texts in the firſt Column, He is altogether excluded; and is no God at all. He cannot, upon your Principles, be the ſame God, becauſe He is not the ſame Perſon: He cannot be another God, becauſe excluded by thoſe Texts. If therefore He be neither the ſame God, nor another God; it muſt follow that He is no God. This is the difficulty which I apprehend to lie againſt your Scheme; and which you have not ſufficiently attended to.

I ſhall therefore charge it upon you once again, and leave you to get clear of it, at leiſure.

I ſhall take it for granted, that the deſign and purport of thoſe Texts, cited from *Iſaiah*, was the ſame with that of the *firſt Commandment:* Namely, to draw the People off from placing any Truſt, Hope, or Reliance in any but God, to direct them to the only proper object of Worſhip, in oppoſition to all Things or Perſons, beſides the one Supreme God. "Neither *Baal* nor *Aſhtaroth*, nor any that are "eſteemed Gods by the Nations, are ſtrictly and "properly ſuch. Neither Princes nor Magiſtrates, "however called Gods in a looſe Metaphorical "Senſe, are ſtrictly or properly ſuch. No reli-"gious Service, no Worſhip, no Sacrifice is due "to any of them: I only am God, in a juſt "Senſe; And therefore I demand your Homage "and Adoration. Now, upon your *Hypotheſis*, we muſt add; that even the *Son of God* Himſelf, however *divine* He may be thought, is

really no God at all, in any juſt and proper Senſe. He is no more than a *nominal* God, and ſtands excluded with the reſt: All Worſhip of Him, and Reliance upon Him, will be *Idolatry* as much as the Worſhip of Angels, or Men, or of the Gods of the Heathen would be. God the Father He is God, and He only; and *Him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* This I take to be a clear Conſequence from your Principles, and unavoidable.

You do, indeed, attempt to evade it by ſuppoſing that, when the Father ſaith *there is no God beſides me*, the meaning only is, that there is no *Supreme* God beſides me. But will you pleaſe to conſider.

1. That you have not the leaſt Ground or Reaſon for putting this Senſe upon the Text. It is not ſaid there is no other *Supreme* God beſides me; but abſolutely, *no Other.*

2. If this were all the meaning, then *Baal* or *Aſhtaroth*, or any of the Gods of the Nations, might be look'd upon as *inferior Deities*, and be ſerved with a ſubordinate Worſhip, notwithſtanding any thing theſe Texts ſay, without any Peril of Idolatry, or any Breach of the firſt Commandment. *Solomon* might Sacrifice to *Aſhtaroth*, and *Milcom*, to *Chemoſh* and *Moloch*, provided He did but ſerve the *God of Iſrael* with *Soveraign* Worſhip, acknowledging Him *Supreme.* And this might furniſh the *Samaritans* with a very plauſible excuſe, even from the Law it ſelf, for *ſerving their own*

* 1 Kings c. 11. *Gods*

Gods in Subordination to the one *Supreme* God; since God had not forbidden it.

3. You may please to consider farther, that there was never any great Danger of either *Jew* or *Gentile* falling into the Belief of many *Supreme* Gods; or into the Worship of more than one as *Supreme*. That is a Notion too silly to have ever prevailed much, even in the ignorant Pagan World. What was most to be guarded against, was the Worship of *inferior* Deities, besides, or in Subordination to, one *Supreme*. It cannot therefore reasonably be imagined that those Texts are to bear only such a Sense, as leaves room for the Worship of *inferior* Divinities.

The Sum then is, that by the Texts of the Old Testament, it is not meant only that there is no other *Supreme* God; but absolutely *no Other:* And therefore our blessed Lord must either be included and comprehended in the one Supreme God of *Israel*, or be entirely excluded with the other pretended, or nominal, Deities. I shall close this Argument with St. *Austin*'s Words to *Maximin*, the *Arian* Bishop, who recurr'd to the same Solution of the Difficulty which you hope to Shelter your self in.

" * Repeat it ever so often, that the Father

* Clama quantum vis, Pater est Major, Filius Minor, respondetur tibi; duo tamen sunt Major & Minor. Nec dictum est Dominus Deus tuus *Major* Dominus unus est: sed dictum est Dominus Deus tuus Dominus unus est. Neque dictum est, non est alius *æqualis* mihi, sed dictum est, non est alius præter me. Aut ergo Confitere Patrem & Filium unum esse Dominum Deum, aut aperte nega Dominum Deum esse Christum. *August.* l. 2. c. 23. p. 727.

" is *greater*, the Son *leſs*. We ſhall anſwer " you as often, that the *greater* and the *leſs* " make *Two*. And it is not ſaid, *Thy* greater " *Lord God is one Lord:* But the Words are: " *The Lord thy God is one Lord:* Nor is it " ſaid. *There is none other* Equal *to me*, but " the Words are, *There is none other* Beſides " *me*. Either therefore acknowledge that Fa- " ther and Son are one Lord God; or in plain " Terms deny that Chriſt is Lord God at all. This is the difficulty which I want to ſee clear'd. You produce Texts to ſhow that the Father *ſingly* is the Supreme God, and that Chriſt is excluded from being the Supreme God: But I inſiſt upon it, that you miſunderſtand thoſe Texts: becauſe the Interpretation you give of them, is not reconcileable with other Texts; and becauſe it leads to ſuch Abſurdities as are too ſhocking even for your ſelf to admit. In ſhort; either you prove too much, or you prove nothing at all.

QUERY II.

Whether the Texts of the New Teſtament (in the ſecond Column) do not ſhow that He (Chriſt) *is not excluded, and therefore muſt be the ſame God?*

THE Texts cited, if well conſidered, taking in what goes before or after; are enough to ſhow that Chriſt is not excluded among the *nominal*

nominal Gods, who have no Claim or Title to our Service, Homage, or Adoration. He is God before the World was, *God over all bleſſed for ever*, Maker of the World, and worſhip'd by the Angels; and therefore certainly He is not excluded among the *nominal* Gods whom to worſhip were Idolatry. But ſince all are excluded, as hath been before ſhown, except the one Supreme God, it is very manifeſt that He is the ſame with the one Supreme God. Not the ſame *Perſon* with the *Father*, as you groundleſly object to us, but *Another* Perſon in the ſame Godhead; and therefore the Supreme God is more Perſons than one. You argue, p. 40. that *if Chriſt be God at all, it unavoidably follows that He cannot be the ſame individual God with the ſupreme God, the Father.* By *individual God*, you plainly mean the ſame *individual divine Perſon*, which is only playing upon a Word, miſtaking our Senſe, and fighting with your own Shadow. Who pretends that the Son is the *ſame Perſon* with the Father? All we aſſert is, that He is the ſame Supreme God; that is, partaker of the ſame undivided Godhead. It will be proper here briefly to conſider the Texts, by which you attempt to prove, that the Son is excluded from being the one Supreme God: only let me remind you, once again, that you forget the part you was to bear. Your Buſineſs was not to *oppoſe*, but to *reſpond:* not to raiſe Objections againſt our Scheme; but to anſwer thoſe

which were brought againſt your own. You obſerve * from *John* 8. 54. *Matt.* 22. 31, 32. and *Acts* 3. 13. that God the Father was the God of the *Jews*, the God of *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*. Very right. But how does it appear that the Son was not? Could you have brought ever a Text to prove, that God the Son was not God of *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*; I muſt then have own'd that you had argued pertinently.

You next cite, *Joh.* 17. 3. 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. *Eph.* 4. 6. to prove that the Father is ſometimes ſtiled the *only true* God, which is all that they prove. But you have not ſhown that He is ſo called in oppoſition to the Son, or excluſive of Him. It may be meant in oppoſition to Idols only, as all Antiquity has thought; or it may ſignify that the Father is *primarily*, not *excluſively*, the only true God, as the firſt Perſon of the bleſſed Trinity, the Root and Fountain of the other Two. You obſerve † that *in theſe and many other Places, the one God is the Perſon of the Father, in Contradiſtinction to the Perſon of the Son.* It is very certain that the Perſon of the Father is there diſtinguiſh'd from the Perſon of the Son; becauſe they are diſtinctly named: And you may make what uſe you pleaſe of the Obſervation, againſt the *Sabellians*; who make but one Perſon of two. But what other uſe you can be able to make of it, I ſee not; unleſs you can prove this *negative* Propoſition, that

* Pag. 34. † Pag. 34. no

no ſufficient reaſon can be aſſign'd for ſtiling the Father the *only* God, without ſuppoſing, that the Son is excluded. *Novatian*'s Remark upon one of your Texts, *Joh.* 17. 3. (*Thee, the only true God and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent*) may deſerve your Notice. * He applies the Title of the *only true God* to both, ſince they are join'd together in the ſame Sentence, and eternal Life is made to depend upon the knowing of one, as much as of the other. He did not ſee that peculiar Force of the excluſive Term, (*only*) which you inſiſt ſo much upon. He knew better; being well acquainted with the Language, and the Doctrine of the Chriſtian Church. His Conſtruction, to ſpeak modeſtly, is at leaſt as plauſible as yours. If you can find no plainer or clearer Texts againſt us, you'l not be able to help your Cauſe. As to 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. All that can be reaſonably gathered from it, is, that the Father is there *emphatically* ſtiled *one God*; but without deſign to exclude the Son from being God alſo: as the Son is *emphatically* ſtiled *one Lord*; but without deſign to exclude the *Father* from being Lord alſo. Reaſons may be aſſign'd for the *Emphaſis* in both Caſes; which are too obvious to need reciting. One Thing you may pleaſe to obſerve; that the Diſcourſe there,

* Si noluiſſet ſe etiam Deum Intelligi, cur addidit, & quem miſiſti Jeſum Chriſtum, niſi quoniam & Deum accipi voluit: *Novat. Trin.* c. 24.

See the ſame Argument illuſtrated and improved by the great Athanaſius: Orat. 3. p. 558. Vol. 1. Edit. Bened.

v. 4, 5. is about *Idols*, and *nominal* Gods and Lords, which have no claim or title to religious Worſhip. *Theſe* the Father and Son are both equally diſtinguiſhed from: which may inſinuate, at leaſt, to us; That the Texts of the Old or New Teſtament declaring the Unity and excluding others, do not exclude the Son, *by whom are all Things:* So that here again you have unfortunately quoted a Paſſage, which inſtead of making for you, ſeems rather againſt you. You have another, which is *Eph.* 4. 6. *One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.* A famous Paſſage, which has generally been underſtood by the * Antients of the whole Trinity. *Above all* as Father, *through all*, by the Word, and *in all* by the Holy Ghoſt. However that be, this is certain, that the Father may be reaſonably called the *one*, or *only*, God, without the leaſt Diminution of the Son's *real* Divinity: a fuller Account of which Matter you may pleaſe to ſee in Dr. *Fiddes*'s Body of Divinity, Vol. 1. p. 383, *&c.* As to the remaining Texts cited by you, ſome are meant of Chriſt as *Man.* or as *Mediator:* And thoſe which certainly reſpect him in a higher Capacity, may be accounted for on this Principle, that we reſerve, with the Antients, a *Priority* of *Order* to the Father, the *Firſt* of the Bleſſed Three.

* *Irænæus* l. 5. c. 18. p. 315. Ed. Bened. *Hippolytus* Contr. Noet. c. 14. p. 16. Fabric. Ed. *Athanaſius* Ep. ad Serap. *Marius Victorin.* B. P. Tom. 4. p. 258. *Hieronym.* Tom. 4. p. 1. p. 362. Ed. Bened.

This

This may ſerve for a general Key to explain the Texts mention'd, or others of like import. I cannot, in this place, deſcend to Particulars, without running too far into the *Defenſive*; and leading the Reader off from what we began with. Had you pleas'd to obſerve the rules of ſtrict method in diſpute, you ſhould not here have brought Texts to ballance mine: but ſhould have reſerved them for another place. All you had to do, was to examine the Texts I had ſet down in the ſecond Column; and to give ſuch a Senſe of them as might comport with your own *Hypotheſis*, or might be unſerviceable to mine. You ſhould have ſhown that *Joh.* 1. 1. *Heb.* 1. 8. and *Rom.* 9. 5. may fairly be underſtood of a *nominal* God only; one that ſtands excluded, by the Texts of the firſt Column, from all Pretence, or Title, to religious Homage and Adoration: For, as I have before obſerved, He muſt either be entirely excluded, or not at all: and if He be not excluded, He is comprehended in the one Supreme God, and is one with Him: or, at leaſt, you ſhould have ſet before the Reader your Interpretation of thoſe Texts, and have ſhown it to be conſiſtent with the Texts of *Iſaiah*. For example, take *Joh.* 1. 1.

" *In the Beginning was the* WORD, *and*
" *the* WORD *was with the* ONE SUPREME
" GOD, *and the* WORD *was* ANOTHER
" GOD inferior to Him, a CREATURE of the
" GREAT

" GREAT GOD: All Things were CREATED by this CREATURE, *&c.*

This Interpretation, which is really yours, as ſhall be ſhown in the Sequel, is what you ſhould have fairly own'd, and reconciled, if poſſible, with the Texts of *Iſaiah*, (purpoſely deſign'd to exclude all *inferior*, as well as *co-ordinate* Gods) and particularly with *Iſaiah* 46. 9. *Before me there was no God form'd, neither ſhall there be* AFTER ME: Words very full and expreſſive againſt any *Creature-Gods*. But, inſtead of this, you tell us, God could not be *with Himſelf*, as if any of us ſaid, or thought, that was St. *John*'s meaning. Thus you induſtriouſly run from the Point, miſrepreſent our Senſe, and artfully conceal your own. In this ſlight manner, you paſs over the three firſt Texts already mention'd; but you think you have ſome Advantage of the *Queriſt*, in reſpect of *Phil.* 2. 6. and *Heb.* 1. 3. and not content to ſay, that they come not up to the point; you are very poſitive, that *they prove the direct contrary to that for which they are alledg'd*; and expreſs your *wonder* that *they ſhould be offer'd*. Whether you really *wonder* at a Thing, which no Man who is at all acquainted with Books and Learning can wonder at; or whether only you affect that way of talking, I determine not; but proceed to conſider what you have to offer againſt my Senſe of the two Texts.

Upon

Upon *Phil.* 2. 6. you press me with the Authority of *Novatian*; whom, I do assure you, I very much respect, as I do all the primitive Writers. As to *Novatian*'s Interpretation of *Phil.* 2. 6 it shall be consider'd presently; only, in the first place, let me observe to you, that as to the main of my Argument, built upon that and other Texts, He was certainly on my Side. He * cites *Isa.* 45. 5. and understands it of God the Father; not so as to exclude the Son from being comprehended in the *one God*, but in opposition to false Gods only. He proves the Divinity of Christ from his receiving Worship of the Church, and his being every where present, † besides many other Topicks; and makes Him ‡ *Consubstantial* with God the Father. This is as much as I mean by his being *one* with the *Supreme God*; and therefore I have nothing to fear from this Writer, who agrees so well with me in the main, and cannot be brought to bear Evidence against me, unless, at the same time, He be found to contradict Himself. This being

* Ego Deus, & non est præter me. Qui per eundem Prophetam refert: Quoniam majestatem meam non dabo alteri, ut omnes cum suis Figmentis Ethnicos excludat & Hæreticos. *C.* 3. *p.* 708. *See also the Citation above* p. 9.

† Si Homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo adest ubique invocatus, cum hæc hominis natura non sit, sed Dei, ut adesse omni loco possit? *C.* 14. *p.* 715.

‡ Unus Deus ostenditur verus & æternus Pater, a quo solo hæc vis Divinitatis emissa etiam in Filium tradita & directa rursum per *Substantiæ Communionem* ad Patrem revolvitur. *Father is here stiled* emphatically *the one God, but still comprehending, not excluding the Son,* consubstantial *with Him.* Ch. 31. p. 730.

premis'd,

premis'd, let us now ſee what He ſays to the Text above mention'd, *Phil.* 2. 6. *He ſaith of the Son* (I uſe your own Words, p. 35.) *that tho' He was in the Form of God, yet He never compared Himſelf with God his Father.* You have tranſlated the laſt Words as if they had run thus; *Deo, patri ſuo.* The Words are, *Nunquam ſe Deo Patri aut comparavit, aut contulit. Never compared Himſelf with God the Father.* The Reaſon follows, *Memor ſe eſſe ex ſuo Patre: Remembring He was from his Father:* That is, that He was *begotten*, and not *unbegotten.* He never pretended to an *equality* with the Father, in reſpect of his *Original*, knowing Himſelf to be *ſecond* only in Order, not the *firſt* Perſon of the ever Bleſſed Trinity. You may ſee the like Expreſſions in * *Hilary* and † *Phæbadius*; who can neither of them be ſuſpected of *Arianizing* in that Point. You afterwards cite ſome other Expreſſions of *Novatian*, particularly this: *Duo æquales inventi duos Deos merito reddidiſſent.* Which you might have render'd thus: *Had they both been equal* (in reſpect of Original, both unbegotten) *They had undoubtedly been two Gods.*

See the ‡ whole Paſſage as it lies in the Au-

* *Hilary Trin.* l. 3. c. 4. p. 816. Ed. Bened.

† *Phæbad.* p. 304.

‡ Si enim natus non fuiſſet, innatus comparatus cum eo qui eſſet innatus, æquatione in utroque oſtenſa, duos faceret innatos, & ideo duos faceret Deos. Si non genitus eſſet, collatus cum eo (qui) genitus non eſſet & æquales inventi, duos Deos merito reddi-

thor

thor himſelf, and not maim'd and mutilated as you quote it, from Dr. *Clarke*. There is nothing more in it than this, that Father and Son are not two Gods, becauſe They are not both *unoriginated:* which is the common Anſwer made by the Catholicks to the charge of *Tritheiſm*; not only before, but after the *Nicene Council*; as might be made appear by a Cloud of Witneſſes, were it needful. What you are pleas'd to call *a moſt ſtrong Teſtimony againſt an abſolute Coequality* (meaning this Paſſage of *Novatian*) is, if rightly underſtood, and compared with what goes before and after, a moſt ſtrong Teſtimony of ſuch a *Coequality* as we contend for. And therefore Dr. *Whitby*, having formerly cited the whole Paragraph as a full and clear Teſtimony of the Son's *real* Divinity, concludes thus. The Author, ſays He, in this Paſſage, " *does in the plaineſt words imagin- " able, declare that Chriſt is God, *equal* to " the Father in every reſpect, excepting only " that He is God *of God*. The Doctor indeed has ſince chang'd his Mind; and now talks as confidently the other way, upon † this very Paſſage. Whether He was more likely to ſee clearly then, or ſince, I leave to others to

diſſent non geniti; atque ideo duos Chriſtus reddidiſſet Deos, ſi ſine Origine eſſet, ut Pater, inventus, & ipſe principium omnium, ut Pater, duo faciens principia, duos oſtendiſſet nobis conſequenter & Deos. *C.* 31.

* Ubi verbis diſertiſſimis oſtendit (Novatianus) Chriſtum eſſe Deum, Patri æqualem paremque, eo tantummodo excepto, quod ſit Deus de Deo. *Whitb. Tract. de Ver. Chr. Deitate*, p. 67.

† *Whitby*, diſquiſitio Modeſt. *p.* 164.

judge

judge, who will be at the Pains to compare his former with ſome of his latter Writings.

You have given us the Sum of the 31*ſt* Chapter of *Novatian*, *as it ſtands collected by the Learned Dr.* Clarke *in his excellent Anſwer to Mr.* Nelſon's *Friend.* You may next pleaſe to conſult the no leſs *excellent* Reply, by Mr. *Nelſon*'s Friend, p. 170, *&c.* where you may probably meet with Satisfaction.

But to return to our Text, *Phil.* 2. 6. The words, οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, you tranſlate; *He* did not *affect*, did not *claim*, did not *aſſume*, *take upon Him*, or *eagerly deſire*, *to be Honoured as God.* Afterwards, p. 36. *He never thought fit to claim to Himſelf Divinity*, or more *literally*, you ſay, *He never thought the Divinity a Thing to be ſo catch'd at by Him, as to equal Himſelf with God his Father.* This you give both as *Novatian*'s Senſe, and as the *true Senſe* of the Text. And you endeavor to confirm it from the Authorities of *Grotius*, *Tillotſon*, *Whitby*, and *Clarke*; who, by the way, are very different from each other in their Interpretations of this Place, hardly two of Them agreeing together. * However not to ſtand upon Niceties, I may yield to you your own Interpretation of this Paſſage, *did not affect to be Honoured as God*; For the ſtreſs of the Cauſe does not ſeem

* *I am perſwaded that the Words may very juſtly be tranſlated He did not very highly value, did not inſiſt upon,* his equality *with God, but condeſcended,* &c.

ſo

ſo much to lie in the Interpretation of thoſe Words, as of the Words foregoing. *viz.* ὃς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων. " Who being *in the Form* " *of God*, that is, * *truly* God (which beſt " anſwers to the *Antitheſis* following, the " *Form of a Servant* ſignifying as much as " *truly* Man) and therefore might juſtly have " aſſumed to *appear as God*, and to be always " *Honoured as ſuch*, yet did not do it, at " the time of his Incarnation; but for a Pat- " tern of Humility, choſe rather to veil His " Glories, and, in appearance, to empty Him- " ſelf of Them, taking upon Him human Na- " ture, and becoming a Servant of God in that " Capacity, &c. What is there in this Para- phraſe or Interpretation, either diſagreeable to the Scope of the Place, or the Context, or to the ſober Sentiments of Catholick Antiquity, not only after, but before the Council of *Nice*; as may appear from the Teſtimonies cited in

* Tertullian's *recital of this Text, and Comment upon it, are worth Remarking.* Plane de ſubſtantia Chriſti putant & hîc Marcionitæ Suffragari Apoſtolum ſibi, quod Phantaſma Carnis fuerit in Chriſto, quum dicit, Quod *in Effigie Dei conſtitutus non rapinam exiſtimavit Pariari Deo, ſed exhauſit ſemetipſum accepta Effigie ſervi*, non veritate; *& ſimilitudine Hominis*, non in Homine; *& Figura inventus ut Homo*, non Subſtantia, id eſt, non Carne. ——— Numquid ergo & Hic quà in Effigie eum Dei collocat? Æque *non erit Deus Chriſtus vere, ſi nec Homo vere fuit in Effigie Hominis Conſtitutus.* Contr. Marc. l. 5. c. 20. p. 486. Non ſibi magni aliquid deputat quod ipſe quidem æqualis Deo, & unum cum Patre, eſt. *Orig. in Epiſt. ad Rom. l. 5.* Θεὸς μὲν κενώσας ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ. Concil. Antioch. Labb. Vol. 1. p. 848. Ὁ μονογενὴς τῷ Θεῷ λόγῳ. Θεὸς ὑπάρχων ὁμοίως Θεῷ, κεκένωκεν ἑαυτὸν καὶ τὴν ἀξίαν ταύτην σάρκα ἠμπίσχετο. Hippolytus, Vol. 2. p. 29. Fabric.

The reſt of the Paſſage is excellently well worth the Reader's peruſal.

the Margin? Now, if this be the Senſe of it, which I might farther confirm by the Authorities of *Athanaſius*, *Jerom*, *Auſtin*, *Chryſoſtom*, *Theophylact*, *Oecumenius*, and others of the Antients, beſides * Biſhop *Pearſon* and †Biſhop *Bull* among the Moderns, why ſhould you *wonder* to find it again cited in the ſame Cauſe, being ſo full and pertinent to the Matter in Hand? Next, we may proceed to the other Text, which you as groundleſly pretend to be *directly contrary* to that for which it is alledged. It is *Hebr.* 1. 3. *Who being the Brightneſs of his Glory, and the expreſs Image of his Perſon*, &c. Here you are ſo obliging as to cite only one Paſſage out of *Euſebius*, againſt me, I would ſay, for me. *Euſebius*, writing againſt the *Sabellians*, preſſes Them with this Text, and argues thus from it. " The Image, and that whereof it is the " Image, cannot both be the ſame Thing (in " the *Sabellian* Senſe) but they are *two Sub-* " *ſtances*, and *two Things*, and *two Powers*: from whence He rightly infers, or plainly means to do, that the *Father* is not the *Son*, but that they are *really* diſtinct. What is there in this at all repugnant to what the *Queriſt* maintains? The force of your Objection lies, I ſuppoſe, in this, that Father and

* *On the Creed: Article* 2.

† Def. Fid. N. 49. 70. Prim. Trad. p. 38. Qui unus locus, ſi recte expendatur, ad omnes Hæreſes adverſus Jeſu Chriſti Domini noſtri perſonam repellendas ſufficit. D. F. p. 37.

Son

Son are called δύο ὐσίαι, δύο πρόσωπα, and δύο δυνάμεις, inconsistently, you imagine, with *individual* Consubstantiality.

I will not be bound to vindicate every Expression to be met with in *Eusebius:* But, allowing for the Time, when it was wrote, before the sense of those Words was fix'd and determin'd, as it has been since; there may be nothing in all this, which signifies more than what the Catholick Church has always meant by *two Persons*; and what all must affirm, who believe a real Trinity. So [a] *Pierius* call'd Father and Son ὐσίας δύο, meaning no more than we do by two distinct Persons: And *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria*, the first Champion for the Catholick Cause against *Arius*, in his Letter to *Alexander* Bishop of *Constantinople*, scruples not to call Father and Son [b] δύο πρόσωπα; and *Tertullian* intimates that they are [c] *duæ res, sed Conjunctæ*; and *Methodius* uses [d] δύο δυνάμεις, meaning two Persons. These or the like strong Expressions, occurring in the *Catholick* Writers, were only to guard the more carefully against *Sabellianism*, the prevailing *Heresy* of those Times. But after *Arianism* arose, there was greater danger of the opposite extreme: And therefore they began to soften this manner of Expression, lest any should be led to think, that the Persons of the Trinity were so distinct as to be

a *See* Phot. Cod. 119. p. 300. b Apud Theod. l. 1. c. 4.
c Contr. Prax. c. 8. p. 504. d Phot. Cod. 235. p. 137.

independent of, separate from, and aliene to, each other. Thus, instead of δύο φῶτα, which might be innocent before, and is used by * *Origen*, They chose rather to say, † φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς: rather than say, *duæ essentiæ*, which might be liable to mistakes; They would say, *Essentia de Essentia*, as *Deus de Deo*. The design of all which was, so to assert a *real* Distinction, as not to teach three absolute, independent, or separate Substances; so to maintain the *distinction* of Persons, as not to *divide* the Substance. Three *real* Persons is what I. what every *Trinitarian*, what all sound Catholicks assert. Now let us return to the Text, *Heb.* 1. 3. Having shown you that *Eusebius*'s Comment is not pertinent to our present Dispute, nor at all affects the Cause that I maintain, which, I assure you, is not *Sabellianism*: Now let me proceed a little farther, to vindicate my use of that Text; which, you pretend, is strong against me. *Origen* perhaps may be of some Credit with you; and the more for being admired by the *Arians*, and much censur'd by many of the *Catholicks*, but after his own Times. ‡ His Comment, upon a parallel Text to this, together with this also, is pretty remarkable. "If "He (Christ) be the Image of the *invisible*, "the Image it self must be *invisible* too. I "will be bold to add, that since He is the Re- "semblance of his Father, there could *not have*

* Comment. in Joh. p. 70. † *See* Athanas. V. 1. p. 553.
‡ Apud Athanas. Decret. Synod. Nic. Vol. 1. p. 233.

been

" *been a Time when He was not.* He goes on to argue, that ſince God is Light, and Chriſt the 'Απαύγασμα, or ſhining forth of that Light, quoting this Text, that They could never have been ſeparate one from the other, but muſt have been *Co-eternal.*

[a] *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*, another *Ante-Nicene* Writer, draws the very ſame Inference from the ſame Text. And *Alexander* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, in his circular Letter, [b] extant in *Athanaſius*, makes the like uſe of it. The latter part of the Text eſpecially, the words, *expreſs Image of his Perſon*, were very frequently and triumphantly urg'd by the *Catholicks* againſt the *Arians:* by [c] *Alexander* of *Alexandria*, [d] *Athanaſius*, [e] *Hilary*, [f] *Baſil*, [g] *Gregory Nyſſen*, [h] *Gregory Nazianzen*, [i] *Cyril*, and Others.

This may ſatisfy you that it was neither *ſtrange*, nor *new*, to alledge this Text in favor of Chriſt's Divinity. When you have any thing farther to object, it ſhall be fairly examin'd. In the mean while, let it ſtand, to ſupport the Second Query; which returns upon you, and expects a fuller Anſwer. That it may come to

a 'Απαύγασμα δὲ ὢν φωτὸς ἀϊδίε, πάντως καὶ αὐτὸς ἀϊδιός ἐστιν. ὄντος γὰρ ἀεὶ τοῦ φωτὸς, δῆλον ὡς ἔστιν ἀεὶ τὸ ἀπαύγασμα. Apud Athanaſ. de Sent. Dionyſ. p. 253.

b Πῶς ἀνόμοιον τῇ ἰδίᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς, ὁ ὢν εἰκὼν πλείᾳ καὶ ἀπαύγασμα τοῦ πατρὸς. Apud Athanaſ. Vol, 1. p. 399.

c Epiſt. ad Alexand. Theodor. p. 17. d Orat. 1. p. 424. de Synod. p. 743. e De Trin. p. 975. 1085. 1159. f Contr. Eunom. p. 28. 89. g Contr. Eunom. p. 460. h Orat. 36. i Dial. 5. de Trin.

you recommended in the beſt Manner, and in the beſt Company, I ſhall here ſubjoin the Teſtimonies of the *Ante-Nicene* Writers, all declaring that the Son is not excluded from being the *one God*, but is included and comprehended therein: that is, tho' the one God *primarily* denotes the Father, yet not *excluſively*, but comprehends the Son too. Now, as often as the primitive Writers ſpeak of Father and Son together, as the one God, in the Singular, they bear witneſs to this Truth. See the Teſtimonies of *Irenæus*, *Athenagoras*, *Tertullian*, *Clement* of *Alexandria*, and *Origen*, collected in [a] Dr, *Fiddes*'s Body of Divinity, to which may be added [b] *Hippolytus*, [c] *Lactantius*, and even *Euſebius* Himſelf, who acknowledged [d] *one God in three Perſons*, as *Socrates* informs us.

I proceed next to other Teſtimonies more expreſly declaring, that the Son is not excluded from being the one Supreme God, by the ſeveral Texts of Scripture, which aſſert the unity; but is always underſtood or implied, as comprehended in the ſame one God. [e] *Irenæus* ſays "that the Holy Scriptures declare the *one* and

a Vol. 1. p. 387, &c.

b Οἰκονομία συμφωνίας συνάγεται εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν, εἷς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ Θεός, ὁ γὰρ κελεύων πατὴρ, ὁ δὲ ὑπακούων υἱὸς, τὸ δὲ συνεπίζον ἅγιον πνεῦμα. Ὁ ὢν πατὴρ ἐπὶ πάντων, ὁ δ' υἱὸς διὰ πάντων, τὸ δὲ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐν πᾶσιν. Ἄλλως δὲ ἕνα Θεὸν νομίσαι μὴ δυνάμεθα, ἐὰν μὴ ὄντως πατρὶ, καὶ υἱῷ καὶ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι πιστεύσωμεν. Hippol. Contr. Noet. p. 15, 16. Fabric. Edit.

c Lib. 4. c. 29.

d Ἕνα Θεὸν ἐν τρισὶν ὑποστάσεσι. Socr. E. H. l. 1. c. 23. p. 48.

e Univerſæ Scripturæ ——— unum & Solum Deum, ad excludendos alios, prædicent omnia feciſſe per *Verbum Suum*, &c. l. 2. c. 27. p. 155. Bened. Edit.

"*only*

" *only* God, excluding all Others, to have " made all Things by HIS WORD. *Others* are excluded but not his *Word*, that is, *his Son*, by whom He made all Things, as *Irenæus* conſtantly underſtands it. At other times, He ſays, " God * made all Things by *Himſelf:* " interpreting *Himſelf*, by *His Word* and by " *His Wiſdom*; that is, *His Son*, and the *Holy* " *Spirit*. Certainly, he could not think that God, in his Declarations of the Unity, meant to exclude what was ſo near to Him, as to be juſtly (not in a *Sabellian* Senſe) interpreted *Himſelf*. Many more Paſſages of the like Import might be cited from this primitive and excellent Writer. I ſhall only add a † Paſſage or two to ſhow, that He look'd upon the Son as the *only true* God, as well as the Father. He obſerves, that the Holy Scriptures never call any Perſon abſolutely God or Lord, beſides

* Fecit ea per ſemetipſum: hoc eſt per Verbum & Sapientiam ſuam. Adeſt enim ei ſemper *Verbum* & *Sapientia*, Filius & *Spiritus*, per quos, & in quibus, omnia libere & ſponte fecit, Lib. 4. c. 20. p. 253.

† Nunquam neque Prophetæ neque Apoſtoli alium Deum nominaverunt, vel Dominum appellaverunt, præter *Verum & Solum Deum*. L. 3. c. 8. p. 182. Neque igitur Dominus, neque Spiritus Sanctus neque Apoſtoli eum qui non eſſet Deus, definitive & abſolute Deum nominaſſent aliquando niſi eſſet *Vere* Deus. L. 3. c. 6.

Now ſee what follows.

Utroſque Dei appellatione ſignavit Spiritus & eum qui ungitur, *Filium*, & eum qui ungit Patrem. L. 3. c. 6. p. 180.

This Father goes on, in the ſame Chapter, to produce ſeveral other Inſtances from the Holy Scripture to prove that the Son is called (definitively and abſolutely) God. That is plainly his meaning, as any Man may ſee by looking into the Chapter. I may add that He applies the Title of Solus Deus *to Chriſt.* L. 5. c. 17. p. 314.

the *only true God*; and yet presently after takes notice, that both Father and Son are by the same Scriptures *absolutely* so called. See the places in the Margin: For though *absolutely* be not there express'd, yet it is necessarily implied, and is undoubtedly the Author's meaning.

We may go on to *Tertullian*, who is so full and clear to our Purpose, that nothing can be more so. Out of many Passages which might be cited, I shall here content my self with one out of his Book against *Praxeas*. " * There " is therefore one God the Father, and there " is none *Other* besides Him: By which He " does not mean to exclude the Son, but *Ano-* " *ther* God. Now the *Son* is not *Another* " from the Father. Furthermore, do but ob- " serve the drift and tendency of this kind of " Expressions, and you will find, for the most " part, that they concern only the Makers

* Igitur unus Deus Pater, & alius absque eo non est: Quod ipse inferens, non Filium negat, sed Alium Deum. Cæterum Alius a patre Filius non est. Denique, inspice sequentia hujusmodi pronuntiationum, & invenias fere ad Idolorum Factitores atque Cultores Definitionem earum pertinere; ut multitudinem falsorum Deorum Unio divinitatis expellat, habens tamen Filium quanto individuum & inseparatum a Patre, tanto in Patre reputandum, etsi non nominatum. At quin si nominasset illum, separasset, ita dicens, Alius præter me non est, nisi Filius meus. Alium enim etiam Filium fecisset, quem de aliis excepisset. Puta Solem dicere: Ego Sol, & alius præter me non est, ni radius meus; nonne denotasses Vanitatem; quasi non & Radius in Sole deputetur. c. 18. p. 510. *Compare Irenæus*, l. 4. c. 6. p. 234, 235. Non ergo *Alius* erat qui cognoscebatur, & *Alius* qui dicebat *nemo cognoscit Patrem*, sed unus & idem, omnia subjiciente ei Patre, & ab omnibus accipiens Testimonium quoniam *Vere* Homo, & quoniam *Vere* Deus.

and

" and Worshipers of Idols; that *Polytheism* " may be rooted out by a Sense of the *divine* " *Unity*, which nevertheless includes the Son; " who, in as much as He is undivided and in- " separable from the Father, is to be un- " derstood as implied in the Father, tho' He be " not particularly named. Farther; had He " named the Son in this Case, it had been " tantamount to *separating* Him from Him- " self: suppose He had said; there is None " *Other* besides me, except *my Son*; He would " in effect hereby have declared Him to be " Another (or *aliene*) by excepting Him in " that manner out of Others. Suppose the Sun " to say, I am the Sun, and there is not " Another besides me, except *my own Ray*; " would not you have mark'd the Impertі- " nence; as if the Ray were not to be reckon'd " to the Sun, as included in it? Here you see plainly what *Tertullian* means; Namely, that the Son is so much one with the Father, that He cannot be supposed to be excluded among *Other* Deities: He is not *Another*, but *the same* God with the Father: and yet this He asserts in a dispute against *Praxeas*, one of the same Principles, in the main, with *Noetus* and *Sabellius:* So careful was He not to run Things into the opposite extreme. He takes care so to assert the Son to be the *same God* with the Father, as not to make Him the *same Person:* And on the other hand, while He maintains the Distinction of Persons, He does

not

not forget to keep up the true Catholick Doctrine of the *Unity of Substance.*

I shall next cite *Athenagoras*: This learned and judicious Writer, having proved at large, that there is but one God, the Father; and that the Christians acknowledged no *Other* God; yet immediately adds, [a] νοοῦμεν γὰρ καὶ υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, *c.* 9. *p.* 37. as much as to say, we comprehend and include the Son in that one God; we are always to be understood with this reserve, or [b] *Salvo* to the Divinity of the Son; as does clearly appear from what follows in the same Chapter, and in the next to it, where the Son is call'd [c] the *Mind* and *Word* of the Father, and declared to be [d] *Uncreated*, and [e] *Eternal.* And in [f] another place He very plainly comprehends Both in the *one God.* To avoid Prolixity, I shall content my self with [g] referring only to the Passages in others of the *Ante-Nicene* Writers, leaving you to consult Them at your leisure, if you can make any doubt of so clear a Case. As to the *Post-Nicene* Fathers,

a *Parallel to which is that in* Athanasius, Orat. 3. p. 558. Νοεῖται δὲ σὺν τῷ μόνῳ καὶ ὁ υἱός. *And again:* Ἐν τῷ ἑνὶ, καὶ μόνῳ, καὶ πρώτῳ συνὼν νοεῖται ὁ λόγος. *See* Tertull. Contr. Prax. c. 19.

b Salvo enim filio, recte unicum Deum potest determinasse cujus est Filius. Tertull. adv. Prax. c. 18.

c Νοῦς καὶ λόγος τοῦ πατρός. c. 10. p. 39.

d Οὐχ ὡς γενόμενον. e Ἀΐδιος.

f Θεὸν ἄγοντες τὸν ποιητὴν τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγον. p. 122. *Compare* p. 40.

g *Clemens Alexandr.* p. 129. 135. 142. *Origen Contr. Cels.* l. 8. p. 386. & alibi. *Hippolytus Contr. Noet.* passim. *Novatian.* c. 3. *Dionysius Romanus*, apud *Athanas.* *Dionysius Alexand.* apud *Athanasium*, p. 254.

Athana-

Athanaſius, *Baſil*, the *Gregory's*, *Jerom*, *Auſtin*, *Chryſoſtom*, &c. Their Sentiments are well known, in the preſent Point; and how they do not only reject, but abhor the Principles which you are endeavouring to revive. However, I ſhall tranſcribe one Paſſage out of *Athanaſius*, part whereof has been given above, which may ſerve as a Comment upon the *Catholicks* which went before Him, whoſe Sentiments He was perfectly well acquainted with, and had thoroughly imbibed.

" * When the Prophet, ſpeaking of the Crea-
" tion, ſaith, *Which* Alone *ſpreadeth out the*
" *Heavens*, Job. 9. 8. And when God ſays,
" *I* Alone *ſtretch forth the Heavens*, Iſ. 44. 24.
" It is very manifeſt to every Man, that in Him,
" who is ſaid to be *Alone*, the *Word* of that
" *Alone*, is alſo ſignified, in whom all Things
" were made, and without whom Nothing was
" made. If therefore the Heavens were made
" by the *Word*, and yet God ſays, *I Alone*;
" and the Son, by whom the Heavens were
" made, is underſtood to have been with the
" *Alone* God; for the ſame reaſon alſo, if it
" be ſaid, *one God*, and *I Alone*, and *I the*
" *Firſt*, we are undoubtedly to underſtand,
" that in the *One*, *Alone*, and *Firſt*, is com-
" prehended the *Word*, as Effulgency, ἀπαύ-
" γασμα, is implied in Light. *Athanaſius*'s reaſoning in this Paſſage is ſo like *Tertullian*'s upon the ſame Head, that one might think He

* *Athanaſ.* Orat. 3. Contr. Arian. p. 558.

had

had borrow'd it from Him. But, indeed, it is ſo entirely conformable to the true and genuine Sentiments of the *Catholicks* before Him, that it may juſtly paſs for the general Senſe of All.

To confirm what hath been ſaid, I ſhall uſe one Argument more, before I paſs on to another Query; ſuch as, if carefully conſider'd, may be ſufficient to ſilence all farther doubt or ſcruple, with regard to the Senſe of the *Ante-Nicene* Writers.

It is well known, that they ever look'd upon the *Son*, as the *God of the Jews*, the God of *Abraham*, *Iſaac* and *Jacob*, that is, the one Supreme God. Many particular Teſtimonies may be cited in Proof of the Fact, which, for Brevity ſake, I paſs over; and proceed to a more general Argument drawn from their citing of Texts out of the Old Teſtament, in which the *one Supreme God* is undoubtedly ſpoken of; and applying them to the Perſon of Chriſt, the ſecond Perſon of the ever Bleſſed Trinity.

**They heard the Voice of the Lord God walking in the Garden.—— And the Lord God called unto* Adam, &c. Gen. 3, 8, 9.

† *The Lord appeared to* Abram, *and ſaid unto him, I am the Almighty-God; walk before me, and be thou perfect*, Gen. 17. 1, 2.

* *Theophil. Antioch.* p. 129. *Ed. Ox. Tertullian*, adv. *Prax.* c. 16.

† *Clem. Alex. Pædag.* l. 1. c. 7. p. 131. *Euſeb. Demonſtr. Ev.* l. 5. c. 9. E. H. l. 1. c. 2.

And

[a] *And the Lord appeared unto him in the plains of* Mamre. *The Lord ſaid unto* Abraham, &c. Gen. 18. 1. 13.

[b] *The Lord rained upon* Sodom, *and upon* Gomorrah *brimſtone and fire from the Lord out of Heaven*, Gen. 19. 24.

[c] *And* Abraham —— *ſtood before the Lord*, &c. Gen. 19. 27.

[d] *And God ſaid unto* Abraham, &c. Gen. 21. 12.

[e] *And behold, the Lord ſtood above it, and ſaid, I am the Lord God of* Abraham *thy Father, and the God of* Iſaac, Gen. 28. 13.

[f] *I am the God of* Bethel, *where thou anointedſt the Pillar*, &c. Gen. 31. 13.

[g] *And God ſaid unto* Jacob, *ariſe, go up to* Bethel, —— *and make there an altar to God, that appear'd unto Thee*, &c. Gen. 35. 1.

[h] *God called unto him out of the midſt of the Buſh.* He ſaid, —— *I am the God of* Abraham, *the God of* Iſaac, *and the God*

a *Juſtin. Martyr.* p. 213. *Sylburg. Ed. Novat.* c. 26. *Tertull. Prax.* c. 16, 17. *Euſeb. Dem. E.* l. 5. c. 9. *Epiſt. Synod. Antioch. Labb.* Tom. 1. p. 845.

b *Juſt. Mart.* p. 215. *Irenæus*, l. 3 c. 6. p. 180. *Tertull. Prax.* c. 13. 16. *Euſeb. E. H.* l. 1. c. 2. *Novat.* c. 21. 26.

c *Juſt. Mart.* p. 216.

d *Juſt. Mart. Novat.* c. 26.

e *Juſt. Mart.* p. 218. *Clem. Alex. Ped.* l. 1. c. 7. p. 131.

f *Juſt. Mart.* 218. *Clem. Alex. Ped.* l. 1. c. 7. p. 132. *Novat.* c. 27. *Euſeb. Demon. Ev.* l. 5. c. 10. *Epiſt. Synod. Antioch. Labb.* Tom. 1. p. 848.

g *Juſtin Mart.* 218. *Cyprian. Teſt.* l. 2. c. 6. p. 35. *Ed. Ox.*

h *Juſt. Mart.* p. 220. *Irenæus*, l. 3. c. 6. p. 180. l. 4. c. 12. p. 241. l. 4. c. 5. p. 233. *Tertull. Prax.* c. 16. *Epiſt. Synod. Antioch. Labb.* Tom. 1. p. 348.

of

of Jacob, &c. Exod. 3. 4. 8.

[a] *And God said unto Moses*, I AM THAT I AM. *The Lord God of your Fathers, the God of* Abraham, *of* Isaac, *and of* Jacob, *appear'd*, Exod. 3. 14, 15.

[b] *I appeared unto* Abraham, *unto* Isaac, *and unto* Jacob, *by the name of God Almighty, but by my name* Jehovah, *was I not known unto them*, Exod. 6. 30.

[c] *I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the Land of* Egypt, Exod. 20. 2.

[d] *God of* Israel, Exod. 24. 10.

[e] *The Lord strong and mighty, the Lord mighty in battle. The Lord of Hosts, He is the King of Glory*, Psal. 24. 8. 10.

[f] *Be still, and know that I am God. I will be exalted*, &c. Psal. 46. 10.

[g] *God is gone up with a shout*, The Lord (Jehovah) &c. Psal. 47. 5.

[h] *The mighty God, even the Lord, hath spoken —— Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence*, &c. Psal. 50. 1. 3.

a Irenæus, *ubi supra*. That is, He must of consequence understand this of Christ as well as, *v.* 4. 8. (See *True Script. Doctrine continu'd* p. 159, 160.) *Tertull. adv. Prax.* c. 17. *Just. Mart. Apol.* 1. p. 96. *Ox. Ed.*

b *Just. Martyr.* p. 278. *Sylbur. Edit.*

c *Clem. Alexand. Padag.* l. 1. c. 7. p. 131.

d *Euseb. Demonstr. Ev.* l. 5. c. 18.

e *Just. Mart. Dial.* p. 197. *Cyprian. adv. Jud.* l. 2. c. 29. p. 49, 50. *Orig. in Matt.* p. 438. *Euseb. in loc.*

f *Cyprian. adv. Jud.* l. 2. c. 6. p. 35.

g *Just. Martyr. Dial.* p. 197. *Euseb. in Psal.* 23. p. 91.

h *Iren.* l. 3. c. 6. p. 180. *Cyprian. adv. Jud.* l. 2. c. 28. p. 48. —*it. de Bono Patietn.* p. 220. *Euseb. in Psal.* p. 209.

Let

[a] *Let God arise, and let his Enemies*, &c. *Sing unto God, sing Praises*, &c. Ps. 68. 1. 4.

[b] *In* Judah *is God known*, &c. Ps. 76. 1.

[c] *God standeth in the Congregation of the mighty: he judgeth among Gods*, Ps. 82. 1.

[d] *The Lord reigneth*—— Ps. 99. 1.

[e] *Behold, God is my Salvation: I will trust and not be afraid, for the Lord* Jehovah *is my strength*, &c. Is. 12. 2.

[f] *Behold your God will come with Vengeance, even God with a Recompence, He will come and save you*, Is. 35. 4.

[g] *That stretcheth out the Heavens like a Curtain*, &c. Is. 40. 22.

[h] *Thus saith the Lord that created thee, O* Jacob, *and that formed thee, O* Israel, Is. 43. 1.

[i] *Thus saith the Lord, the King of* Israel, *and his redeemer the Lord of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last, and besides me there is no God*, Is. 44. 6.

[k] *I am the Lord that maketh all Things, that stretcheth forth the Heavens alone, that spreadeth abroad the Earth by my self*, Is. 44. 24.

a *Cyprian. adv. Jud.* l. 2. c. 6. c. 28. p. 35, 49.
b *Irenæus*, l. 3. c. 9. p. 184.
c *Just. Mart. Dial.* p. 277. *Irenæus*, l. 3. c. 6. p. 180. *Novat. de Trin* c. 15. *Cyprian. adv. Jud.* l. 2. c. 6. p. 35. *Euseb. in loc.*
d *Justin. Martyr.* p. 224.
e *Irenæus*, l. 3. c. 2. p. 286.
f *Irenæus*, l. 3. c. 20. p. 214. *Novat.* c. 12. *Epist. Synod. Antioch. Labb.* Tom. 1. p. 845.
g *Hippolyt. Contr. Noet.* c. 18. p. 19. πήξας ὡς καμάραν τ̀ ἐρανόν.
h *Eusebius in loc.* i *Lactant. Instit.* l. 4. c. 9. p. 405.
k *Eusebius in loc.*

Surely

[a] *Surely God is in thee, and there is none elſe; there is no God,* Iſ. 45. 14.

[b] *I will ſave them by the Lord their God, and will not ſave them by Bow, nor by Sword,* Hoſea 1. 7.

[c] *The Lord alſo ſhall roar out of* Sion, *and utter his voice from* Jeruſalem, Joel 3. 16. Amos 1. 2.

[d] *Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity* —— Mic. 7. 18.

[e] *God came from* Teman, *and the Holy One from mount* Ephraim. —— Habakuk 3. 3.

[f] *I am God, not Man,* Hoſea 11. 9.

[g] *I will ſtrengthen them in the Lord,* —— *ſaith the Lord,* Zech. 10. 12.

[h] *This is our God, and there ſhall none other be accounted of in Compariſon of him,* Baruch 3. 35.

Theſe ſeveral Texts, beſides others of like Nature, the *Ante-Nicene* Writers, in general, underſtood of Chriſt. And therefore it is exceeding clear, that, according to the Doctrine of that Time, the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity

a *Cyprian. ad. Jud.* l. 2. c. 6. p. 34. *Euſeb. Dem. Ev.* l. 5. c. 4. p. 225. *Lactant. Epitom.* c. 44. p. 116. *Edit. Dav. Inſtit.* p. 404. *Edit. Ox.. Epiſt. Synod. Antioch. Labb.* Tom. 1. p. 845.

b *Novat. Trin.* c. 12.

c *Irenæus,* l. 3. c. 20. p. 214. l. 4. c. 33. p. 273.

d *Irenæus,* l. 3. c. 20. p. 214.

e *Irenæus,* l. 3. c. 20. p. 214. l. 4. c. 33. p. 273.

f *Cyprian. Teſtim.* l. 2. c. 6. p. 35. *Euſeb. Dem. Ev.* l. 5. c. 22. p. 249. *Epiſt. Synod. Antioch. Labb.* Tom. 1. p. 845.

g *Cyprian. Teſt.* l. 2. c. 6. p. 35. *Euſ. Dem. Ev.* l. 5. c. 26. p. 251.

h *Cyprian. Teſt.* l. 2. c. 6. p. 35. *Lactant. Epit.* p. 116. *Ed. Dav.*

is

is the *Lord*; the *Lord God*; the *Almighty God*; the *Lord God* of *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*; The *Jehovah*; the *Lord* of *Hoſts*; the *Mighty God*; the *Only God*; and beſides whom there is *no God*; the *God* of *Iſrael*, &c. All this, I ſay, Chriſt is, according to the Doctrine of thoſe early Times: not excluſive of the Father, any more than the Father is ſuch, excluſive of the Son; but together with the Father: That is, Father and Son Both are the one Supreme God: not one in *Perſon*, as you frequently and groundleſly inſinuate, but in *Subſtance*, *Power*, and *Perfection*. I know, you have an Evaſion, by which you hope to elude the force of all that has been urged. But when I have ſhown you, how weak and inſufficient your Pretence is; I hope, I ſhall hear no more of it.

* In another part of your Book, (*p.* 20.) you pretend that Chriſt ſpake only in the *Perſon* of the Father; and that when He ſaid, for inſtance, *I am the God of Bethel*, Gen. 31. 13. the meaning is no more than this; *Jehovah whom I repreſent, and in whoſe Name I ſpeak, is the God of Bethel.* Had you given it only as your *own* Interpretation of this, and the like Texts, it might be very excuſable: But having told us what you mean by ſpeaking *in the Perſon of God the Father*, you afterwards add, that it was the *unanimous Opinion of all Antiquity*, that Chriſt appear'd and ſpake,

* *See alſo* Clarke's Script. Doctr. *p.* 102.

in the Perſon of God the Father (*p.* 22.) leaving your *Engliſh* Reader to believe, that your novel Explication was the current Doctrine of all Antiquity. The Thing may be true in *ſome Senſe*, ſuch as is foreign to your Purpoſe: But in *your Senſe*, it is notoriouſly falſe, as all that have look'd into Antiquity very well know. However, for the Benefit of the common Reader, I will ſhow that the good Fathers applied theſe Texts to Chriſt conſider'd in his *own Perſon*; and not in the Father's only. This ſhall be made clear, to a Demonſtration, both from *particular* Teſtimonies of the ſame Fathers; and from the *general* Scope, Drift, and Deſign of thoſe Writers, in citing the Texts before mention'd.

* *Clement* of *Alexandria*, citing *Exod.* 20. 2. *I am the Lord thy God*, &c. and underſtanding it of Chriſt, obſerves particularly, that Chriſt ſaid this of Himſelf, *in his own Perſon.*

† *Irenæus*, having cited *Exod.* 3.6. (*I am the God of* Abraham, *and the God of* Iſaac, &c.) which He underſtands as ſpoken by *Chriſt*; ‡ goes on thus. " From hence (Chriſt) made " it plain, that He who ſpoke to *Moſes* out

* Πάλιν δὴ ὅταν λέγῃ διὰ τῆς ἰδίας προσώπης, ἑαυτὸν ὁμολογεῖ παιδαγωγόν. ἐγὼ κύριός σου, ὁ θεός σου, ὁ ἐξαγαγών σε ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου. Clem. Alex. Pæd. l. 1. c. 7. p. 131. Edit. Ox.

† Per Hæc utique manifeſtum fecit quoniam is qui de Rubo locutus eſt Moyſi, & Manifeſtavit se eſſe Deum Patrum, Hic eſt viventium Deus ——— Ipſe igitur Chriſtus cum Patre Vivorum eſt Deus, qui locutus eſt Moyſi, qui & Patribus manifeſtatus eſt. Iren. l. 4. c. 5. p. 232.

‡ *See* lib. 3. c. 6 lib. 4. c. 12.

" of

" of the Buſh, and manifeſted *Himſelf* to be " the *God* of the *Fathers*, is the *God* of the " *Living*. And after a deal more in that Chapter to ſhow that the Father and Son are One and the ſame God, He concludes to this effect. " Chriſt Himſelf therefore, with the " Father, is the God of the *Living*, who ſpake " to *Moſes*, and was manifeſted to the Fa- " thers.

Novatian, having obſerved that the Angel which appeared to * *Agar*, *Sarah*'s Maid, was repreſented in Holy Scripture as *Lord* and *God*, after ſome reaſoning upon it, ſuitable to the prevailing Principles of his own Times, as well as of the Times preceding, Summs up the whole in this Manner. " †Wherefore if the preſent " Paſſage cannot ſuit with the *Perſon* of the " Father, whom it would not be proper to call " an *Angel*, nor to the *Perſon* of an *Angel*, " which it would not be proper to call God; " but it may comport with the *Perſon* of " Chriſt both to be God, as the Son of God, " and to be an Angel too, as ſent to reveal his " Father's Will: The Hereticks ought to con-

* *See Geneſis* c. 16.

† Ergo ſi hic locus neque *Perſonæ* Patris congruit ne Angelus dictus ſit, neque *Perſonæ* Angeli, ne Deus pronuntiatus ſit: *Perſonæ* autem Chriſti convenit, ut & Deus ſit, quia Dei Filius eſt, & Angelus ſit, quoniam paternæ diſpoſitionis Adnuntiator eſt; intelligere debent contra Scripturas ſe agere Hæretici, qui Chriſtum quum dicant ſe & Angelum credere, nolint etiam illum *Deum* pronuntiare ——— Novat. c. 26. p. 724.

Ὁ δὲ Ἄγγελος τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ υἱὸς ἐστὶν αὐτὸς Κύριος καὶ Θεὸς ὤν. Synod. Antioch. Ep.

" ſider that They run counter to the Sacred " Writ, while They admit that Chriſt is an *An-* " *gel*, and yet refuſe to acknowledge that He " is *God* alſo. Here, you'll obſerve, that, according to *Novatian*, it was to the *Perſon* of Chriſt, not to the *Perſon* of God the Father, that the Titles of *God* and *Lord*, in this or the like Inſtances, belong'd; and that therefore they are given to Him in his *own Perſon*, in his own right, as God's Son and Conſubſtantial with Him; than which nothing can be more diametrically oppoſite to Your's, or to Dr. *Clarke*'s *Hypotheſis*. It is not ſaid, *God*, only as having true *Dominion* and *Authority*, but, as *God's Son*; and that implies, with *Novatian*, *Subſtantiæ Communionem*, real and *eſſential* Divinity *.

I ſhall next ſhow you the ſame of *Juſtin Martyr*; and then beg your Pardon for the Impertinence of inſiſting ſo long upon what none, one might think, that has ever ſeen the Antients, could make the leaſt Queſtion of. " Permit me, ſays He, to ſhow you alſo out " of the Book of *Exodus*, how the *very ſame* " Perſon, who appeared to *Abraham* and *Ja-* " *cob*, as an Angel, and God, and Lord, and " Man, appear'd to *Moſes* in a Flame of Fire " out of the Buſh, and talked with Him. A little after, He adds theſe remarkable Words.

* C. 31. *Compare* Ch. 11. Ut enim præſcripſit Ipſa natura Hominem credendum eſſe, qui ex Homine ſit: ita eadem natura præſcribit, & Deum credendum eſſe, qui ex Deo ſit.

" * You

" * You have ſeen, Gentlemen, that the " ſame Perſon whom *Moſes* calls an Angel, " and who convers'd with Him in the Flame " of Fire; that very Perſon *being God*, ſigni- " fies to *Moſes* that *Himſelf* is *the God of* " Abraham, *and of* Iſaac, *and of* Jacob. I will not ſo far diſtruſt your Judgment, as to add any farther Comment to ſo plain Words. I need but juſt hint to any who know *Juſtin Martyr*, that He, as well as *Novatian*, reſolves the *Divinity* of Chriſt into his † *Sonſhip*; and *Sonſhip* into ‡ Communication of the ſame divine *Subſtance*: Which I remark chiefly againſt Dr. *Clarke*, who ſeems to admit that thoſe Titles belong'd to the *Perſon* of Chriſt; which is more than I apprehend you do. It were very eaſy to add particular Paſſages to the ſame purpoſe from other Fathers; but it was, in a manner, needleſs to have mention'd theſe. For, the general ſcope, drift, and deſign of the primitive Writers, in this Caſe, ſhows ſufficiently what I contend for. Their deſign was to prove Chriſt's *Divinity*; to ſhow that there was *another Perſon*, beſides the *Father*, who was really *Lord and God*; and that this Perſon was *Chriſt*. This is the avowed deſign clear through *Juſtin*'s

* Ὦ ἄνδρες, νενοήκατε ——— ὅτι ὃν λέγει μωσῆς Ἄγγελον, ἐν πυρὶ φλογὸς λελακέναι αὐτῷ, οὗτος αὐτὸς Θεὸς ὤν. σημαίνει τῷ μωσεῖ ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ Θεὸς Αβραὰμ καὶ Ισαὰκ καὶ Ιακώβ. Juſt. Mart. Dial. p. 220.

Compare Apol. 1. Τὸ δὲ εἰρημένον ἐκ βάτου τῷ Μωσεῖ ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν, ὁ Θεὸς Αβραὰμ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ιακώβ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων σοῦ, σημαντικὸν τοῦ καὶ ἀποθανόντας ἐκείνους μένειν καὶ εἶναι αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀνθρώπους.

† p. 75. 278. 280. Sylb. Ed. ‡ p. 281.

Dialogue; and the like may be ſaid of *Novatian*, *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Irenæus* and the Reſt, where they cite theſe Texts, which I have given you a Liſt of.

The Argument they uſed, is this. There is a Perſon frequently ſtiled *God and Lord*, *Jehovah*, *Almighty*, &c. who convers'd with *Adam*, appear'd to the *Patriarchs*, and all along headed and conducted the People of the *Jews*. This Perſon could not be an *Angel* only: ſuch high Titles could never belong to any meer Angel. He could not be God the Father: His Office was *miniſterial*, He is called an Angel, He *appear'd*, He condeſcended to take upon Him human Shape, and other reſemblances*: Theſe Things do not ſuit with the *firſt Perſon* of the Trinity. Well then; who could He be, but God the Son? Who being really God, might, in his own right, truly and juſtly aſſume thoſe high Titles; and yet being *Second* only in the ever Bleſſed Trinity, and deſigning, in his own due Time, to take human Nature upon Him, might more ſuitably condeſcend to act *miniſterially* among Men, (a proper prelude to his Incarnation which ſhould come after) and ſo might be, not only *God*, but an *Angel* too. This is their Argument, as

* *I do not find, that the* pure ſimplicity of the divine Nature *was ever urged, in this Caſe, as a reaſon why it could not be the Father: nor, that the* human Affections and Actions aſcribed to this Angel, *were underſtood* literally, *or otherwiſe than by way of* Figure. Tertullian *gives a very different account of it, ſhowing how all might be underſtood* Θεοπρεπῶς. Contr. Marc. l. 2.

every

every one knows, that knows any thing of these Matters. Now, suppose that these good Fathers had understood, *Gen.* 31. 13. as you do; *I am the God of Bethel:* That is, my Father, *whom I represent*, is the God of *Bethel.* What a trifling Argument would you here put into their Mouths? "Christ declares that the Per-"son, whom He represents, is God and Lord: "therefore *Christ* is *God*, &c. Or propose the "Argument thus, upon your *Hypothesis:* The "*Lord God* (the Father) called unto *Adam*, Gen. "8. 9. *God said unto* Abraham, *&c.* Gen. 21. 12. "that is, God *the Father* spoke by his Son; "therefore the Son is called God, and is God. Can any thing be more ridiculous? The Conclusion which *Justin Martyr* draws from the whole, and which He triumphantly urges against *Trypho*, is this; that Christ is really Lord and God. Θεὸς καλεῖται, καὶ Θεός ἐστι καὶ ἔστιν. The other Writers draw the same Conclusion from the same Premises; a Conclusion without any Thing to support it, had they understood these Texts, as you prerend They did. In short, the very Ground and Foundation of all They say upon this Article, is built upon a Supposition diametrically opposite to Your's; so little countenance have you from Antiquity. Farther, They all conclude that the Person declaring Himself to be *God and Lord*, &c. could not be an Angel; not a meer Angel. There is some Sense in this; if you suppose an Angel declaring, in his *own Person*, that He is God and Lord. It is

blaſphemous and abſurd for any meer Angel to make ſuch Declaration. But, ſuppoſing it meant of the Perſon of the Father, why might not any Angel declare, what is certainly true, that the Father is God, or deliver God's errand in his own Words? Had the Fathers thought, as you do, they muſt have argued thus, very weakly: It could not be a meer Angel that appear'd, or that ſpoke thus and thus. Why? Becauſe the Perſon who ſent Him, and who undoubtedly is the God of the Univerſe, is called *God* and *Lord*. Of all the ſilly Things that Ignorance and Malice have combined to throw upon the primitive Martyrs and Defenders of the Faith of Chriſt, I have not met with one comparable to this. I am therefore willing to believe, that you did not mean to charge them with it; but only expreſs'd your ſelf darkly and obſcurely; which yet ſhould not have been done, by one who would be careful not to miſlead, even an unwary Reader. I would here make one Remark, and leave it with you: And that is, of the * ſtrict Senſe wherein the *Antients* uſed the word *God*, as applied to the *Son*. They argued that it could not be an *Angel* that appeared. Why? becauſe the Perſon appearing was called *God*. Thus *Novatian*, who ſpeaks the Senſe of all the reſt. *Quomodo ergo* Deus *ſi Angelus fuit*; *cum non ſit hoc nomen Angelis unquam*

* *Other Arguments of the ſtrict Senſe of the Word*, God, *as uſed by the* Ante-Nicene *Writers, and applied to the Son, may be ſeen in Dr.* Fiddes, p. 374, &c.

con-

*conceſſum**? *But how then is He God, if no more than Angel, ſince Angels never had the privilege of ſo high a Title?* *Novatian* allows (Ch. 15.) that *Angels* have been called *Gods*, meaning in the looſe Figurative Senſe: But here He plainly ſignifies that the Word, *God*, when applied to the *Son*, is to be underſtood in the ſtrict and proper Senſe: And thus the *Antients* in general underſtood it. *Angels*, the very higheſt order of Creatures, were not by them thought worthy of the Name and Title of *God*. It would have been highly abſurd, in their Judgment, to have given it them, in ſuch a Senſe, and in ſuch Circumſtances, as they applied it to the *Son*. They knew nothing of your *Relative* Senſe of the Word: They knew better. But this by the Way: Let us return to our Subject. You'll ask me now perhaps, what did ſome of the Fathers mean, thoſe eſpecially whom you have quoted in the Margin (*p.* 22.) by the *Son of God, appearing, and ſpeaking* in the *Perſon* of God the Father? I have ſhown you what they certainly did *not* mean: And if I could not ſo readily account for the other, it is of leſs Moment; the Cauſe being little concern'd in it. But I ſhall endeavor to ſatisfy you in this Point alſo.

You have but two Quotations, which are any thing to the Purpoſe: One out of *Theophilus*, Biſhop of *Antioch*; and the other from *Tertullian*. And they indeed, *verbally*, may ſeem to countenance your Notion; tho', in *reality*, they

* Ch. 26.

they meant nothing like it. But, what did they mean, one by, * ἐν προσώπῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, the other by, † *Auctoritate & nomine* (Patris?) Let it be considered, that the second Person, in the Texts above cited, is not represented under his own *personal* distinguishing Character, as a Son, or second Person, or Messiah, or Mediator, as He has been since. It is not said, that the *Son* of the *Lord God*, called unto *Adam*; but the *Lord God called*, &c ‡. It is not, I am the *Son* of the God of *Bethel*, &c. But I am the *God of Bethel*; and so in the rest. Christ therefore, in these, or the like Texts, is not represented under his own peculiar Character; but under such a Character as is *common* to the Godhead, to the Father and Him too. This Character, since the distinction of Persons has been revealed to us, has been, in a more eminent and peculiar Manner, reserved to the Father. He is represented *eminently* now as God; and Christ, as *Son of God*; or *Mediator*, or *Messiah*. Christ having before took upon Him that Part, Character, or Office, which since that time has been reserved, in a peculiar manner, to the Father, may be said to have acted in the *Person* of the Father, or *in the Name* of the Father; that is, under the same Character or Capacity, which the Father now chiefly bears, with respect to Men. This He might well do, being equally qualified for either. As

* Theoph. ad Autol. l. 2. p. 229. Ox. Ed.
† Tertull. adv. Marc. l. 2. c. 27. ‡ Gen. 3. 9.

Son

Son of God. He was really God; and as *Son* of the Almighty, He was *Almighty*, in his *own right*, as **Tertullian* expreſſes it. And therefore might as juſtly bear the Stile and Title of *Lord God*, *God of Abraham*, &c. while He acted in that Capacity, as He did that of *Mediator*, *Meſſiah*, *Son of the Father*, &c. after He condeſcended to act in another, and to diſcover his perſonal Relation.

You cited theſe Words of *Tertullian*: *Cujus Auctoritate* † *& nomine ipſe erat Deus, qui videbatur, Dei Filius*. Which might have been rendred thus: "The Son of God who ap-"peared, He was God (acting) in his (the Fa-"ther's) Name, and with his Authority. And had you but cited the next immediate Words, you might have diſcovered the true meaning of that Paſſage. *Sed & penes nos, Chriſtus in perſona Chriſti, quia & hoc modo noſter eſt*: That is to ſay: But with us (Chriſtians) Chriſt is alſo underſtood under the Character, or Perſon, of the *Meſſiah*: Becauſe He is *ours* in this Capacity alſo: That is, He is not only our *God*; but our *Mediator* and *Redeemer*. And under that Character we receive Him, as being more *peculiar* to Him, beyond what He has in common with the Father. Formerly He was received and adored under the one *common* Cha-

* Suo jure omnipotens qua Filius Omnipotentis —— cum & Filius Omnipotentis tam Omnipotens ſit, quam Deus Dei Filius. *Prax.* c. 17. p. 520.

† Contr. Marc. l. 2. c. 27.

racter

racter of *God*, *Lord*, and *Jehovah*: not meerly as representative of God the Father, or as invested with his *Authority*, but as strictly and truly *God*, *Consubstantial* with God the Father; according to the unanimous Opinion of all the *Antients*, and * of those in particular, who speak of his acting in the *Name*, or *Person* of the Father. But now, having a new Title to distinguish Him by, we receive Him in both Capacities: as God, by *Nature*; and as Messiah, or Mediator, by *Office*.

The Sum then of the Case is this: When Christ appear'd to the *Patriarchs*, and claim'd their Obedience, Homage, and Adoration; He did not do this under the Name and Character which He has since discovered to be *personal* and *peculiar* to Him; but under another; which is His too, but in *common* with the Father; namely, that of *Lord God*, *God Almighty*, &c. and being since discovered not to be the Father Himself, but the *Son*; not *unoriginated*, but *God* of *God*; all that He did must be refer'd back to the Father, the *Head* and *Fountain* of All; whose Authority He exercis'd, whose Orders He executed, and whose *Person*, *Character*, or *Office*, He represented and sustained. Thus, under the † New Testament also, He referred all that He did to the Authority of the Father, as the first Original, and Fountain of all Power, Pre-eminence, Dignity,

* See *True Script. Doctr. continu'd*, p. 196.
† Vid. Tertull. Contr. Prax. c. 21. p. 512.

&c.

&c. acting in His Name, executing His Will, and repreſenting His Perſon. (*I and my Father are one*, Joh 10.30. *He that hath ſeen me, hath ſeen the Father*, Joh. 14.9. *I can of my own ſelf do nothing*, Joh. 5.30.) And yet whatever is ſaid of Chriſt, is to be underſtood of Him in his *own Perſon*; and not of the *Father* only, whom He repreſented. In fine, it is not neceſſary that every one who acts *in the Name*, or *by the Authority*, or *in the Perſon* of another, ſhould uſurp the Stile of that other, and ſpeak of Him in the *firſt Perſon*; and therefore you can draw no certain Concluſion from the two Paſſages of *Theophilus* and *Tertullian*. On the contrary, I have ſhown you from the whole Drift, Tenor, and Tendency, as well as from particular Teſtimonies of the primitive Writings, that they are far from favouring your pretences in this Caſe, but are a perfect Contradiction to it. From what hath been ſaid, theſe three Things are very plain and evident.

1. That, according to the mind of the Antients, the Son was *God*, and ſo called in his own *Perſon*.

2. That He was *God* in his own Perſon, as being *God's Son*.

3. That He was *God's Son*, as having the *divine Subſtance* communicated from the Father.

Theſe three Conſiderations entirely take off the force of whatever either You, or Dr. *Clarke* hath

hath offer'd to perplex and puzzle a very clear and manifeſt Truth.

I have inſiſted chiefly on the firſt Particular, as was proper in this place; though I have, in paſſing, hinted enough of the two latter alſo; eſpecially conſidering that they will often be glanced at again, in the proceſs of our Diſpute.

Thus, I hope, I have ſufficiently vindicated the Argument of this Second Query, having ſhown, from plain Scripture Texts, that Chriſt is not excluded from being the one Supreme God in Conjunction with the Father; and taken off your Exceptions: And leſt this ſhould ſeem inſufficient, I have confirm'd it farther, from the unanimous conſent of all Antiquity, before the *Council of Nice*; which is what your ſelf appeal to in the Caſe. This Article indeed has hereby been drawn out into a diſproportionate Length: But the Importance of it is a ſufficient Apology. Were you able Satisfactorily to anſwer the following Queries; This one, while it ſtands unanſwered, would be enough for all. But I proceed.

QUERY

QUERY III.

Whether the Word (God) *in Scripture, can reasonably be supposed to carry an* ambiguous *meaning, or be used in a* different *Sense,* when applied to the Father and Son, in the *same Scripture, and even in the same Verse?* See Joh. 1. 1.

HERE you make Answer; that *the Word* (God) *in Scripture hath a relative Signification,* and is used in a *supreme and a subordinate Sense.* And you appeal to Exod. 7. 1. *I have made Thee a God to Pharaoh*; and to Psal. 82. 1. *God standeth in the Assembly of Gods*; *judgeth among Gods*; and you desire that *Joh.* 10. 34, 35. may be compared: *Is it not written in your Law, I said ye are Gods,* &c. You are impatient, I perceive, to come to your Distinction of *Supreme* and *Subordinate*; which, you imagine, clears all Difficulties, and you will not stay to consider what ought to be said first. The first and most general Distinction of the Senses of the Word, *God,* should be into *proper* and *improper*; after which it will be soon enough to come to your famed Distinction of *Supreme* and *Subordinate.* Dr. *Clarke,* indeed, would perswade us, that the *proper* Scripture-Notion of *God* is *Dominion*; and that therefore any Person having *Dominion,* is, according to the Scripture-Notion,

tion, *truly*, and *properly* God. This ſhall be examined; but it will be convenient here to ſet down the Doctor's own Words "The Word "Θεὸς, *God*, has in Scripture, and in all Books "of *Morality* and *Religion*, a *relative* Signi- "fication; and not, as in *metaphyſical* Books, "an *abſolute* one: as is evident from the *re-* "*lative* Terms, which in *moral* Writings may "always be joined with it. For inſtance: In "the ſame manner as we ſay *my* Father, *my* "King, and the like; ſo it is proper alſo to "ſay, *my* God, the God *of Iſrael*, the God "*of the Univerſe*, and the like: Which words "are expreſſive of Dominion and Government. "But, in the metaphyſical Way, it cannot be "ſaid *my* Infinite Subſtance, the Infinite Sub- "ſtance *of Iſrael*, or the like *. He repeats the Obſervation (*p.* 290.) † And is very poſitive that the word *God*, in Scripture, is always a *relative* Word of *Office*; giving the ſame *pret-ty* Reaſon for it, as before. This ſhall be care-fully conſidered; and the manner of ſpeaking accounted for, in the ſequel.

I ſhall only obſerve here, by the way, that the Word, *Star*, is a *relative* Word, for the ſame Reaſon with that, which the Doctor gives for the other. For, the *Star of your God Remphan*, Acts 7. 43. is a proper Expreſſion: But, in the *metaphyſical* Way, it cannot be ſaid, the luminous Subſtance *of your God Rem-*

* *See Dr.* Clarke's *Reply*, p. 284.
† *Compare alſo* Script. Doctr. p. 296.

phan.

phan. So again; *Water* is a *relative* Word; For it is proper to ſay, the Water *of Iſrael:* But, in the *metaphyſical* Way, it cannot be ſaid, the fluid Subſtance *of Iſrael*; The Expreſſion is ‡ improper. By parity of Reaſon, we may make *relative* Words, almoſt as many as we pleaſe. But to proceed: I maintain that *Dominion* is not the full Import of the word *God*, in Scripture; that it is but a part of the *Idea*, and a ſmall part too; and that, if any Perſon be called *God*, meerly on account of *Dominion*, He is called ſo by way of Figure and Reſemblance only; and is not *properly* God, according to the Scripture-Notion of it. We may call any one, a *King*, who lives free and independent, ſubject to no Man's Will. He is a King *ſo far*, or in ſome reſpect; tho' in many other reſpects, nothing like one; and therefore not *properly* a King. If by the ſame Figure of Speech, by way of Alluſion and Reſemblance, any thing be called *God*, becauſe reſembling God in one or more Particulars; we are not to conclude, that it is *properly*, and *truly* God.

To enlarge ſomething farther upon this Head; and to illuſtrate the Caſe by a few In-

‡ *It is very obvious to perceive, where the impropriety of ſuch Expreſſions lies. The word* Subſtance, *according to the common uſe of Language, when uſed in the Singular Number, is ſuppoſed to be* intrinſick *to the Thing ſpoken of, whoſe Subſtance it is; and indeed, to be the Thing it ſelf.* My *Subſtance, is* my Self: *and the Subſtance of* Iſrael, *is* Iſrael. *And hence it comes to be improper to join* Subſtance *with the* relative Terms, *underſtanding it of any thing* extrinſick.

ſtances. Part of the *Idea* which goes along with the Word, *God*, is, that his Habitation is ſublime, and *his dwelling not with Fleſh*, Dan. 2. 11. This part of the *Idea* is applicable to *Angels*, or to *Saints*, and therefore they may thus far be reputed *Gods*; and are ſometimes ſo ſtiled in Scripture, or Eccleſiaſtical Writings. Another part of the complex Idea of God, is giving orders from Above, and publiſhing commands from Heaven. This was, in ſome Senſe, applicable to *Moſes*; who is therefore called *a God unto Pharaoh*: not as being *properly* a God; but inſtead of God, in that Inſtance, or that reſembling Circumſtance. In the ſame reſpect, every *Prophet*, or *Apoſtle*, or even a Miniſter of a Pariſh, might be *figuratively* called *God*. *Dominion* goes along with the Idea of God, or is a part of it; and therefore *Kings*, *Princes*, and *Magiſtrates*, reſembling God in that reſpect, may, by the like Figure of Speech, be ſtiled *Gods:* not *properly*; for then we might as properly ſay, *God David*, *God Solomon*, or *God Jeroboam*, as *King David*, &c. but by way of Alluſion, and in regard to ſome imperfect reſemblance which they bear to *God* in ſome particular reſpects; and that is all. It belongs to God, to receive Worſhip, and Sacrifice, and Homage. Now, becauſe the Heathen *Idols* ſo far reſembled God, as to be made the Objects of Worſhip, *&c.* Therefore they alſo, by the ſame Figure of Speech, are by the Scripture denominated *Gods*, tho' at the ſame time,

time, they are declared, in a proper Senſe, to be *no Gods*. The *Belly* is called the *God* of the Luxurious, *Phil.* 3. 19. becauſe ſome are as much devoted to the Service of their *Bellies*, as others are to the Service of *God*; and becauſe their Luſts have got the *dominion* over them. This way of ſpeaking is, in like manner, grounded on ſome imperfect Reſemblance, and is eaſily underſtood. The Prince of the Devils is ſuppoſed, by moſt Interpreters, to be called the *God of this World*, 2 Cor. 4. 4. If ſo, the Reaſon may be, either becauſe the Men of *this World* are entirely devoted to his Service; or that He has got the Power and Dominion over Them.

Thus we ſee, how the word *God*, according to the popular way of ſpeaking, has been applied to Angels, or to Men, or to Things inanimate and inſenſible; becauſe ſome part of the *Idea* belonging to *God*, has been conceived to belong to them alſo. To argue from hence, that any of them is *properly* God, is making the whole of a part; and reaſoning fallaciouſly, *a dicto ſecundum quid*, as the Schools ſpeak, *ad dictum ſimpliciter*. If we inquire carefully into the Scripture-Notion of the Word, we ſhall find, that neither *Dominion* ſingly, nor all the other Inſtances of Reſemblance make up the *Idea*; or are ſufficient to denominate any Thing *properly* God. When the *Prince of Tyre* pretended to be God, *Ezek.* 28. 2. He thought of ſomething more than meer *Domi-*

nion to make Him ſo. He thought of Strength invincible, and Power irreſiſtible: and God was pleas'd to convince Him of his Folly and Vanity, not by telling Him how ſcanty his *Dominion* was, or how low his *Office*; but how weak, frail, and periſhing his *Nature* was; that He *was Man only*, and *not God*, v. 2. 9. and ſhould ſurely find ſo by the Event. When the *Lycaonians*, upon the ſight of a Miracle wrought by St. *Paul*, Acts 14. 11. took *Him* and *Barnabas* for *Gods*; They did not think ſo much of *Dominion*, as of *Power*, and *Ability*, beyond *Human:* And when the Apoſtles anſwer'd them, they did not tell them that their *Dominion* was only *Human*; or that their *Office* was not *Divine*; but that they had not a *divine Nature:* They were weak, frail, and feeble Men; of like Infirmities with the reſt of their Species, and therefore no *Gods*.

If we trace the Scripture-Notion of one that is *truly* and *properly* God; we ſhall find it made up of theſe ſeveral Ideas; Infinite Wiſdom, Power invincible, All-ſufficiency, and the like. Theſe are the Ground and Foundation of *Dominion*; which is but a ſecondary Notion, a Conſequence of the Former: And it muſt be Dominion *Supreme*, and none elſe, which will ſuit with the Scripture-Notion of *God*. It is not that of a *Governor*, a *Ruler*, a *Protector*, a *Lord*, or the like; but a *ſoveraign* Ruler, an *almighty* Protector, an *omniſcient* and *omnipreſent* Gover-

Governor. An eternal, immutable, all-ſufficient *Creator*, *Preſerver*, and *Protector*. Whatever falls ſhort of this, is not *properly*, in the Scripture-Notion, *God*; but is only called ſo by way of Figure; as has before been explain'd. Now, if you ask me why the relative Terms may properly be applied to the Word *God*, the reaſon is plain; becauſe there is ſomething *relative* in the *whole* Idea of God; namely, the notion of *Governor*, *Protector*, &c. If you ask why they cannot ſo properly be applied to the Word, *God*, in the *metaphyſical Senſe*; beſide the reaſon before given, there is another as plain; becauſe *Metaphyſicks* take in only *part* of the Idea, conſider the *Nature* abſtracted from the *Relation*, leaving the *relative* Part out.

From what hath been ſaid, it may appear how uſeleſs and inſignificant your Diſtinction is, of a *ſupreme* and a *ſubordinate* God. For, not to mention that this muſt unavoidably run you into *Polytheiſm*, and bring you to aſſert more Gods than one, contrary to the whole Tenor of Holy Scripture; which is an * inſuperable Objection to your *Hypotheſis*; I ſay, not to mention this at preſent, your *Hypotheſis* is built upon a falſe Ground, as if any thing could be *properly* God, that is not *Supreme*. *Supreme*, in the ſtrict

* *See what Dr.* Bennet *has very well urged upon this Head:* Diſc. of the H. Trin. p. 178, &c.

Senſe, ſuppoſes for its ground all the eſſential Properties of one *truly* and *properly* God, as deſcribed in Scripture. *Another* God after this, is *no God*; becauſe Scripture makes but *one*; beſides that an * *inferior* God is only God *improperly*, and ſo called by *way of Figure*, or in ſome particular reſpect: So that at length your famed Diſtinction of a *ſupreme* and *ſubordinate* God, reſolves into *a God*, and *no God*. The Queſtion then, between us, is, whether Chriſt be God *properly*, or *improperly* ſo called; that is, whether He be *God*, or no. Your Arguments to prove Him a *ſubordinate* God only, I ſhall look upon as ſo many Arguments againſt his *Divinity*; and as deſign'd to prove that He is not *God*.

You cite *Joh.* 10. 35, 36. *If He called them Gods, to whom the word of God came, and Scripture cannot be broken; Say ye of Him, whom the Father hath ſanctified, and ſent into the World, Thou blaſphemeſt, becauſe I ſaid, I am the Son of God?* From hence you

* Neque enim proximi erimus opinionibus Nationum, quæ ſi quando coguntur Deum confiteri, tamen & Alios infra Illum volunt. Divinitas autem gradum non habet, utpote unica. *Tertull. adv. Hermog.* c. 7. p. 236. Deus non erit dicendus, quia nec credendus. niſi Summum magnum. Nega Deum, quem dicis deteriorem. *Tertul. Contr. Marc.* l. 1. c. 6.

Qui ſuper ſe habet Aliquem Superiorem, & ſub Alterius poteſtate eſt; Hic neque *Deus*, neque Magnus Rex dici poteſt. *Iren.* l. 4. c. 2. p. 229.

Unus igitur Omnium Dominus eſt Deus. Neque enim illa ſublimitas poteſt habere Conſortem, cum Sola omnium teneat poteſtatem. *Cypr. de Idol. Van.* p. 14. *Ox. Edit.*

endea-

endeavor to prove, that Chriſt is *God* in the *ſubordinate* Senſe only; that is, as I have ſaid, not *properly* or *truly* God. But I can ſee no manner of ground for this Inference from the Words before us. Our Bleſſed Lord had inſinuated that He was *really* and *truly* God; but had not aſſerted it in *plain* and *expreſs* Terms: Upon this bare *innuendo*, the *Jews* charge Him with direct *Blaſphemy:* He, to evade their Malice and to keep to the Truth, neither affirms, nor denies that He meant it in the Senſe which they apprehended. However, his Diſcourſe being in general Terms, and not explicite enough to found a charge of Blaſphemy upon, He appeals to their Law, in order to ſhow, that it is not always *Blaſphemy, to make one's ſelf God*, or to apply the Title of *God*, even to mortal Men, and Men inferior to Himſelf, conſidered only as Man. This was anſwer ſufficient to Them; who could not from his own Expreſſions clearly convict Him of meaning more, than that He was God in the *improper* Senſe of the Word, as it had been uſed, *Pſal.* 82. 6. Nevertheleſs, He leaves the point of his *Divinity* undecided; or rather, ſtill goes on to inſinuate, in Words which they could not directly lay hold on, the very Thing which they charged Him with. This enraged them ſo much the more: and therefore they again *ſought to take Him*, v. 39. *But He eſcaped out of their Hand.* This Interpretation may ſuffice to take off the force of your Argument. Yet, the

Words may admit of other, and perhaps better Interpretations, consistent with the Principles which I here maintain *.

You proceed to cite *Heb.* 1. 8, 9. and argue thus: *He who being God, calls another his God, and is sanctified by Him, must needs be God in a subordinate Sense*; that is, God *improperly* so called, or *no God*. To an old Objection, I might return an old Answer, in the words of *Hilary*, or words to the same Effect. " † This may signify only his Subordination, as " a Son, or as God of God, without any In- " feriority of Nature. The Father is his God, " as He is God by being begotten of Him. This Answer is direct and full, upon the Supposition that the Text cited is meant of the divine Nature of Christ, or of Christ in his highest Capacity. But if it be meant, as ‡ probably it may, of his human Nature only, there is no weight in the Objection.

As to the Son's being *sanctified*, I should hardly have thought it of any Importance to the Cause, had it not been twice insisted on by you. May not the Father design, appoint, consecrate his Son, consider'd in either Capacity, to the Office of *Mediator*, without supposing Him of a different and inferior Nature to Him? Or, suppose the *sanctifying* may be meant of

* *See* True Script. Doctr. continued, *p.* 178.

† Ad Nativitatem refertur; cæterum non perimit Naturam; & idcirco Deus ejus est, quia ex eo natus in Deum est. *Hil. de Trin.* l. 4. c. 35. p. 848.

‡ *See* Bennet. Discourse on the Trin. *p.* 31, 33, &c.

the

the human Nature, which the Father has sanctified, by uniting it to the λόγος; what force will there remain in your Objection? Having answer'd your Pleas and Pretences for a *subordinate God*, I proceed to show that Christ is not called *God* in a *subordinate*, or *improper* Sense; but in the same Sense, and in as high a Sense, as the Father Himself is so stiled.

1. Because He is called the *Jehovah*, which is a word of *absolute* Signification, and is the *incommunicable* Name of the one true God.

* He is, very probably, called *Jehovah*, Luk. 1. 16, 17. many shall He (viz. *John* the Baptist) turn to *the Lord their God*, and He shall go before *Him*. The Doctor owns that, *in strictness of Construction*, the words (*the Lord their God*) must be understood of Christ. And therefore Christ is *Lord God*, or *Jehovah Elohim*, which comes to the same.

He is likewise called the *Lord God* of the Prophets, as appears from *Rev.* 22. 6. compared with *v.* 16. of the same Chapter. This may be farther confirmed by comparing the Texts following.

* *See this Text excellently defended and illustrated in* True Scripture Doctr. continu'd, *p.* 132, 133, *&c.*

Of

Of old haſt thou laid the Foundation of the Earth, Pſ. 102. 25. &c. Addreſs'd to the *Jehovah*.

And the Lord (Jehovah) *ſaid unto me: Caſt it unto the Potter; a goodly price that I was priſed at of them*, Zech. 11. 12.

They ſhall look on me (Jehovah ſpeaking by the Prophet) *whom they have pierced*, Zech. 12. 10.

The Voice of Him that crieth in the Wilderneſs, prepare ye the way of the Lord (Jehovah) Iſ. 40. 3.

The Lord ſaid, I will have mercy on the Houſe of Judah, *and will ſave them by the Lord* (Jehovah) *their God*, Hoſ. 1. 7.

[a] *Thou Lord, in the beginning haſt laid the Foundations of the Earth*, Heb. 1. 10.

[b] *Then was fulfilled, That which was ſpoken*, &c. Matth. 27. 9, 10.

Another Scripture ſaith, They ſhall look on Him (Jeſus Chriſt) *whom they have pierced*, Joh. 19. 37.

[c] *The Voice of one crying in the Wilderneſs, prepare ye the way of the Lord*, Mar. 1. 3.

—— *is born in the City of* David, *a Savior, which is Chriſt the Lord*, Luk. 2. 11.

a *See* Surenhuſiii Conciliation. in loc. *p.* 600.

b Surenhuſ. in loc. *p.* 280.

c Surenhuſ. *in Matt.* 3. 3. *p.* 207. *I refer to this Author, to obviate the pretence, that theſe Texts might be underſtood, only by way of* Accommodation.

I have

I have produced the Texts again, in order to take notice of the very peculiar way, which you have of evading. It is your avowed Principle, that Christ is not *Jehovah* in his own Person, (*p.* 24.) and elsewhere: and that the *Person* called *Jehovah* is the Father *only*. What then must be said to these Texts, which are so very plain and express to the contrary; insomuch that * Dr. *Clarke* Himself owns, that the name *Jehovah is given to that visible Person* (meaning Christ) *who appear'd as representing the Person of the invisible God*? He does not say, it was given to the Person *represented* only, but to the Person *representing* also; which you seem to deny. But you confound your self with your † own Comment upon Hos. 1. 7. (*Jehovah would — save them by* Jehovah *their God*) *That is*, say you, *that* Jehovah *himself would save them, but not in his own Person.* Well then; it is by *another Person*, which *Person* the Text expressly calls *Jehovah.*

Upon *Zech.* 12. 10. compar'd with *Joh* 19. 37. you Comment thus (*p.* 26.) *The Sufferings of Christ might well be called the Sufferings of* Jehovah, *being pierced in Effigie in his Son, who is the express Image of his Person.* What a fanciful Turn is here, meerly to elude the force of plain Scripture. Say rather, that since Christ is the *Effigies*, the *express Image* of the *Father*, He might justly be called *Je-*

* *Reply*, p. 163. † p. 25.

hovah,

hovah, which indeed He is, as well as the Father. I ſhall dwell no longer on ſo clear and indiſputable a Point. What you hint, that the Father and Son cannot both be *Jehovah*, or as you expreſs it, one *individual* Being, meaning *one Perſon*, is hardly deſerving Notice; becauſe it is nothing but playing with the word *individual*; and diſputing againſt no Body: either take the word in our Senſe of it, or pretend not that you oppoſe us. It has been obſerved above, that Antiquity is every where full and expreſs in this Matter; never queſtioning, but conſtantly aſſerting, that the Son is *Jehovah*; and ſo called, in Scripture, in his *own Perſon*, and in his own *right*, as *Coeſſential* Son of God. The next Thing which I have to obſerve, is, that *Jehovah* is a word of *abſolute* Signification. The relative Terms do not ſuit with it, as with the other. We do not read *my* Jehovah, or *your* Jehovah, or the Jehovah *of Iſrael*; as is pertinently remark'd by a learned * Gentleman; and the ſame Gentleman obſerves, that it is ſometimes render'd by Θεὸς, or *God:* from whence we may juſt take notice, by the way, that the word Θεὸς, or *God*, in Scripture, is not always, perhaps very rarely, a meer *relative* Word. That *Jehovah* is a Word of *abſolute* Signification, expreſſing God, as *He is*, may be proved, both from † Scripture it ſelf,

* The True Script. Doctr. of the Trin. continued, *p.* 134.

† *See this proved in the* Appendix *to the* Conſiderations *on Mr.* Whiſton's *Hiſtor. Pref.* p. 101.

and

and the * Authorities of the best Criticks in this Case. What you have to object against it, shall be here examined, with all convenient Brevity. † You make the Import of the Name *Jehovah* to be, *giving Being to* (i. e. Performing) *his Promises*. For Reasons best known to your Self, you slip over *Exod.* 3. *v.* 14. which might probably give us the most Light into the Matter; and chuse to found all your Reasonings upon *Exod.* 6. 2, 3, *&c.* an obscure Place, on which you have made almost as obscure a Comment. The Words are, *I am the Lord* (Jehovah) *and I appeared unto* Abraham, *unto* Isaac, *and unto* Jacob, *by the Name of God Almighty* (El Shaddai) *but by my Name* Jehovah, *was I not known unto them.*

You do not, I presume, so understand this Text, as if this was the first Time that God revealed Himself by the Name *Jehovah*. *That* He had done before, *Exod.* 3. 14. And even long before that, to *Abram*, Gen. 15. 7. And *Abram* had address'd Him under that Name, sooner, *Gen.* 15. 2. Nay, it may be run up yet higher, even to *Adam* and *Eve*, Gen. 4. 1. ‡.

Your meaning therefore, I suppose, must be,

* *See the Authorities cited in the second Part of the* Considerations *by the same Author*, p. 2, 3. *And refer'd to in* True Scripture Doctr. continu'd, *p.* 133, 134. † p. 19.

‡ *M.* Le Clerc *thinks that all this may be solved by a* Prolepsis, Com. in Exod. 3. v. 15. *To which it is sufficient to Answer, that it may be otherwise; and that it is highly improbable, that* Moses, *who was particularly careful not to introduce the Name of* Abraham *and* Sarah, *before the proper Time, should not be as careful in respect of a more venerable Name, the Name of God Himself.*

that

that God had given many Inſtances of his *Power* before, conformable to his Name *El Shaddai:* But now, He was to give them Inſtances of his *Veracity* and *Conſtancy* in *performing Promiſes*, conformable to his Name *Jehovah*. This, I think, either is, or ſhould be your Senſe of this obſcure Paſſage. That it is not the true Senſe of the Place, is next to be ſhown.

1. It appears to be a very ſtrain'd and remote Interpretation. The primary Signification of *Jehovah*, is *Being*, by your own Confeſſion, and as all know, that know any thing: and the moſt obvious reaſon of the Name, is, that God is *Being it ſelf*, neceſſarily exiſting, independent, immutable, always the ſame; According to that of *Mal.* 3. 6. *I am the Lord* (Jehovah) *I change not*. After this, in the natural Order, He may be conſidered as the Fountain of *Being*, or *giving Being* to all other Things: So that this ſeems but a *ſecondary* Notion of *Jehovah*. Yours is more *remote* ſtill: it is *giving Being*, not to the World, to Angels, or to Men; But to *Words* and *Promiſes*; that is, fulfilling Them. And this *metaphorical* Senſe of, *giving Being*, you would put upon us, for the *proper* and *ſpecial* Import of the Name *Jehovah*, expreſſing *Being*. Who does not ſee that this is ſtrained and Far fetch'd?

2. The *Reaſon* which you aſſign for this Interpretation, is as lame as the Interpretation it ſelf. *God*, it ſeems, was now coming to *fulfil*

fulfil the promise made to Abraham; and therefore reminds his People of the Name *Jehovah*; as importing one faithful and punctual to his Word. But what if *Jehovah* should import one *eternal* and *immutable* God, the *same yesterday, to day, and for ever*; might not the Consideration thereof be very proper to raise in Men's minds the greatest Confidence and Assurance imaginable, that He should never fail of his Word?

3. Besides, what Account will you give of many other Places of Scripture, where God reminds his People, that He is *Jehovah*; and where there is no Reference at all, to *promises*, or the like?

Thus, in this very Chapter, *Exod.* 6. 39. *I am the Lord:* (Jehovah) *speak thou unto* Pharaoh *King of* Egypt *all that I say unto Thee.* Again; *Against all the Gods of* Egypt, *I will execute Judgment*; *I am* Jehovah, Exod. 12. 12. *None of you shall approach to any that is near of Kin to Him* ——— *I am* Jehovah, Lev. 18. 6. *I am the Lord* (Jehovah) *that is my Name, and my Glory will I not give to another*; *neither my praise to graven Images*, Is. 42. 8. * many more Places of like nature might be cited. But I chuse to refer you to a Concordance for them. What I intend from

* Monf. Le Clerc, *upon the Place, endeavors by Quirk and Subtilty to turn several Passages, wherein the* Jehovah *is mention'd, to one particular Sense, in favour of the* Sabellians. *But that* Author, *and his* Manner *are well known, and with what* Byass *he writes. The very Instances which He brings are enough to confute Him.*

them

them is this; that if your's be the true Account of the ſpecial Import of the Name *Jehovah*, it will be hard to find any Senſe, or Pertinency in thoſe, or other frequent Repetitions of it. But underſtanding the Word, as it has been generally underſtood by Perſons of the greateſt Learning and Judgment, all is *clear*, *pertinent*, and *conſiſtent*.

But, you will ſay, why then does God ſo particularly take notice, that *by his name Jehovah*, He was not known to *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*? Exod. 6. 3. did not they know Him, and worſhip Him, as the true, eternal, independent, immutable God, the Creator of all Things? Yes, certainly they did, and under the Name *Jehovah* too; and probably underſtood the import of it. The moſt probable Solution of the whole Difficulty is this; that the Words, in the latter part of the Text, ought to be underſtood by way of Interrogation, thus: *But by my name* Jehovah, *was I not alſo known unto them?* That great and venerable Name, which expreſſes more than *El-Shaddai*, or any other Name, and which I have choſen for my *memorial* to all Generations?

If you pleaſe to conſult the *Criticks*, you will find this Interpretation ſupported by ſuch Reaſons as will bear Examining. It has been obſerved by the Learned, that ſome of the *Greek* Writers read the Words, καὶ τὸ ὄνομά μου, Κύριος, ἐδήλωσα αὐτοῖς. That is, *my name*, Jehovah, *I made*

made known unto them; which Interpretation is likewise favoured by the *Arabick Version*. This, at least, we may say; that from a Passage so obscure, and capable of several Constructions, no certain Argument can be drawn, for the special import of the Word *Jehovah*, in opposition to the best Criticks in the Language, whether Antient or Modern. Now, to resume the Thread of our Argument; since it appears that Christ is, in his own proper Person, called *Jehovah*, a Word of absolute Signification, expressing the divine *Nature* or *Essence*; it must follow that He is *God*, strictly so called; and not in the *relative* or *improper* Sense, as is pretended.

This will appear farther, if it be consider'd that *Jehovah* is the *incommunicable* Name of the *one true God*. This may be proved from * several Texts, which I shall only point to in the Margin; referring you to † a learned Author, who has abundantly made good the Assertion. I may remark that this and the foregoing Observation serve to support and confirm each other: For, if *Jehovah* signify the eternal immutable God, it is manifest that the Name is *incommunicable*, since there is but one God: and if the Name be *incommunicable*, then *Jehovah* can signify nothing but that one God to whom, and to whom *only*, it is applied. And

* Exod. 3. 14, 15. Deut. 26. 17, 18. Psal. 83. 18. Isa. 42. 8. Hosea 12. 5.

† 2d Letter *to the Author of the* History of Montanism, *p.* 5, &c.

if both these Parts be true, and it be true likewise, that this Name is applied to Christ; the Consequence is irresistible, that Christ is the same one God; not the same Person with the *Father*, to whom also the Name *Jehovah* is attributed, but the same *Substance*, the same *Being*, in a Word, the same *Jehovah*; thus revealed to be more Persons than one. So much for my first Argument to prove that the Word, *God*, when applied to the Father and Son, in Scripture, does not bear a double Meaning, one *proper*, and the other *improper*; but is to be understood in one and the same *true* and *proper* Sense, in respect of Both.

2. My second Argument for it shall be from Joh 1. 1. pursuant to the Words of the Query. *In the beginning was the* Word, *and the* Word *was with God, and the* Word *was God*, v. 1. *All Things were made by Him*, &c. v. 3. Here, we find the *Son* expressly called *God:* And the only Question is, whether in a *proper*, or *improper* Sense. The Circumstances of the place must determine us in this Enquiry. Here are Three Marks to direct us how to form a Judgment. 1. The word Θεὸς, God, is used in a *proper* Sense in the very same Verse. 2. The word was *God* in the *Beginning*, that is, before the *Creation*. 3. The Work of Creation is attributed to Him.

I say, first, the word Θεὸς, *God*, is once used, in a *proper* Sense, in the very same Verse. I have before shown, that the pretended *relative*

tive Sense is only an *improper* and *figurative* Sense of the word *God*, according to the Scripture-Notion of it; and therefore, certainly, That cannot be the meaning of it here, being applied to the *Father*, who, without dispute, is *properly* God. Besides, that since Θεὸς in the *Septuagint* is frequently the rendring of *Jehovah*, as you may readily see by turning to *Kircher*'s *Concordance*; and since St. *John* Himself follows that rendring, as you may observe by comparing, *Joh.* 6. 45. with *Is.* 54. 13. we may reasonably think that ὁ Θεὸς, in the Text, is of the same Signification with *Jehovah:* which is a farther proof that it is to be understood *absolutely*, and not *relatively*, as you term it, or as I, *improperly*. If therefore the word Θεὸς, *God*, be once used by St. *John* in the *strict* and *proper* Sense; How can we imagine that immediately after, in the very same Verse, He should use the same Word in a Sense very different from that of the former? You remark, that *the Article is prefixed before* Θεὸς, *in an absolute Construction, when spoken of the Father*; *but omitted when predicated of the* Λόγος. But if the want of the Article be sufficient to prove that Θεὸς, *God*, when applied to the Word, is of a different meaning; by the same Argument you might prove that the same word, Θεὸς, without an Article, in no less than four places more of this Chapter (v. 6. 12, 13. 18.) is not to be understood of the *one true God*. I cannot help thinking a remark *Trifling*, which

ſignifies ſo little, as either to prove too much, or to prove nothing. Could you ſhow that Θεὸς without the Article, was always taken in a *relative*, or *improper* Senſe, you would do ſomething. All that you attempt to ſhow, is, that ὁ Θεὸς is no where, in the New Teſtament, predicated of the *Word*, in an *abſolute* Conſtruction: And what if it is not? Then, it is not: For, that is all you can make of it. Θεὸς without the Article in many Places, confeſſedly, means as much as Θεὸς with the Article; which is enough for our purpoſe. Or, admitting that there is ſome reaſon and ſignificancy in it, that the Son is not ſtiled ὁ Θεὸς in an abſolute Conſtruction, but that the Title is generally reſerved to the Father, as the Title, ὁ Πατὴρ; all that it ſignifies, is, that the firſt Perſon of the Holy Trinity is *eminently* diſtinguiſh'd by an Article; but not that the Addition, or the Omiſſion, of an Article makes any Alteration in the Senſe of the word Θεός. You ſay, that *three of the moſt learned Ante-Nicene Greek Fathers inſiſt upon* this Remark, about the Article. * *Clemens* of *Alexandria*,

* Clem. Alex. Strom. 3. p. 548. Ed. Ox. Clemens *does not make his Remark on* Joh. 1. 1. *nor does He mention, that the Article is put to diſtinguiſh the Father's Supereminent dignity of Nature above the Son; As your Reader, or perhaps your Self, might imagine. His deſign was only to prove, againſt* Tatian, *that the True God (and not the Devil) was the Author of Conjugal Procreation; for which He cites* Gen. 4. 25. *obſerving, that* Θεὸς *in that Place has the Article* ὁ *before it; and therefore muſt be underſtood of the True God, the* παντοκράτωρ. *By the very ſame Rule, Chriſt muſt be* True God, *in the ſame Senſe, according to* Clemens. *He is* ὁ Θεός. See p. 72. 132. 251. 273.

* *Origen*,

* *Origen*, and † *Euſebius*. But what do they gather from it, or what do they mean by it? Do they mean that the Son is not *God* in the proper Senſe? nothing like it. Do they mean that the Article can never be properly applied when the Son is ſpoken of, or that the Scripture obſerves it as an invariable Rule? That does not appear, but rather the Contrary. For, they underſtood many Texts of the Old Teſtament, where Θεὸς occurs with the Article, of Chriſt, as may appear, in ſome meaſure, from the Texts before laid down; and might be more amply ſet forth by other Evidence, were any needful in ſo clear a Caſe.

The Truth of the whole Matter is, the Title of ὁ Θεὸς, being underſtood in the ſame Senſe with Αὐτόθεος, was, as it ought to be, generally reſerved to the Father, as the diſtinguiſhing *perſonal* Character of the firſt Perſon of the Holy Trinity. And this amounts to no more than the Acknowledgment of the Father's Prerogative, as *Father*. But as it might alſo ſignify any Perſon who is truly and eſſentially God, it might properly be applied to the Son too: and it is ſo applied ſometimes, tho' not ſo often as it is to the Father. However, it is hardly

436. 832. *and likewiſe* ὁ παντοκράτωρ, p. 277. *I might alſo refer to* p. 148. 647. 831. *But the Conſtruction in thoſe places is more dubious.*

* In Joh. p. 46. Origen *means no more than that the Father is,* Αὐτόθεος, *God unoriginated; the Son, God of God.*

† Eccl. Theol. l. 2. c. 17. Euſebius *makes no farther uſe of the Obſervation than to prove, againſt* Marcellus, *that the* λόγος *is a diſtinct* real *Perſon, and not the Father Himſelf.*

worth the while to dispute this Point. The Sum and Substance of all is, that * the Father is *absolutely*, and *eminently* stiled ὁ Θεὸς, as the Fountain of all; the Son Θεὸς, God *of God*, which is sufficient to our purpose. You observe (*p.* 42.) that the LXXII have Θεὸς without the Article, wherever mention is made of *God*, in what you call the *subordinate* Sense. The Inference I should draw from thence, is, that when Θεὸς has the Article prefix'd, the *supreme* God is meant thereby. By this Rule, if the concurrent Sense of the *Ante-Nicene* Writers be of any force or weight with you, our Dispute would be at an end. For they apply innumerable Texts, wherein Θεὸς occurs with the Article, to our Saviour Christ. But if you slight their Authorities, yet I presume you will be concluded by the inspired Writers, who apply some Texts of the Old Testament, which have Θεὸς with the Article, to our Blessed Lord. Compare

Numb. 21. 5, 6. 7.	1 *Cor.* 10. 9.
Isa. 45. 22, 23.	† *Rom.* 14. 11. *Phil.* 2. 10.

I had almost forgot to take notice of one Pretence more you have, for the *subordinate* Sense of Θεὸς, in *Joh.* 1. 1. You word it thus, (*p.* 41.) *He who is God, and at the same time is* with God *who begat Him, must needs be God in a different meaning; unless the same*

* *See this more fully explain'd and illustrated in Dr.* Fiddes's Body of Divinity, *Vol.* 1. *p.* 383, &c. *and* 397, &c.

† Vid. Surenhus. Conciliation. p. 511.

God

God could be with Himſelf, *&c.* To this it is readily anſwer'd, that being *with God* is the ſame as being *with the Father*, (Comp. 1 Joh. 1. 2.) who is God, and *eminently* ſo ſtiled, as being firſt in Order *. If He were not always with Him, and inſeparable from Him, He could not be *God* in a *proper* Senſe. God and God, or God of God, ſuppoſes two *Perſons*; and therefore there is no Foundation for the Objection of the Son's being with *Himſelf*. Having thus endeavored to obviate your Exceptions, I now proceed in the Proof of my Poſition. The *Word* is here (in *Joh.* 1. 1.) ſaid to have been God in *the Beginning*, that is, before the *Creation*; from whence it is farther probable that He is *God*, in the *ſtrict* and *proper* Senſe. This Circumſtance may at leaſt be ſufficient to convince you, that the *relative* Senſe, which you contend for, is not applicable. He could have no *Relation* to the Creatures before they were made; no *Dominion* over them when they were not: And therefore could not be *God* in the Senſe of *Dominion*, or *Office*. But what moſt of all demonſtrates the *Word* to be here called *God* in the proper Senſe, is, that the Creation of all Things is aſcribed to Him.

* *There is no inconſiſtency in admitting a Priority of Order, and yet denying the Son to be God in a* ſubordinate, *or* improper *Senſe. There was a Priority of Order, in reſpect of* Adam *and* Seth: *and yet* Seth *was not Man in a* ſubordinate *Senſe, but in the ſame Senſe as* Adam *was. I uſe not the Similitude, as if it would anſwer in other reſpects: but it may ſerve* ſo far, *to illuſtrate my meaning; which is ſufficient. See* Expoſit. Fid. *attributed to* Juſtin. Mart. *p.* 293. *Sylb. Ed.*

Creation is an indiſputable Mark of the *one true God*; the * diſtinguiſhing Character by which He was to be known, and for which He was to be reverenc'd above all Gods; and on † Account of which, He claims to Himſelf all Homage, Worſhip, and Adoration. But of this I ſhall have occaſion to ſay more hereafter, and therefore ſhall diſmiſs it for the preſent. I muſt not forget to add, that, beſides what I have here urged, by virtue alſo of what hath been proved under Query the firſt, I may come at my Concluſion. For, no Queſtion can be made but that the *Word* is called *God*, by St. *John*, in a higher Senſe than any *nominal* God can pretend to. And therefore, ſince He is not *excluded* with the *nominal* Gods, He is *included* and comprehended in the one ſupreme God; and conſequently, is coeternal and coeſſential with the Father. Enough hath been ſaid in Vindication of the Argument contain'd in this Query: and ſo now I return it upon you ſtanding in full force; and expecting a more compleat, and more ſatisfactory Anſwer.

* Jerem. 10. 11. † Rev. 4. 10. 11.

QUERY

Query IV.

Whether, supposing the Scripture-Notion of God to be no more than that of the Author and Governor of the Universe, or whatever it be, the admitting of Another to be Author and Governor of the Universe, *be not admitting* another God; *contrary to the Texts before cited from* Isaiah; *and also to* Is. 42. 8.--48. 11. *where He declares,* He will not give his Glory to Another?

YOUR Answer is (*p.* 42.) *Supposing the revealed Sense of the Word, God, to imply* Dominion, *and that He is* the Author and Governor of the Universe, *the admitting a* Second Person, *distinct from the one supreme God, to be* Author and Governor, *doth by no means contradict the Passages cited from* Isaiah, *or any Other, or introduce two Gods,* viz. *two supreme Beings, or Persons.* Give me leave to produce the Texts of *Isaiah* once more; and to place others in an opposite Column to them, only *mutatis mutandis,* putting *Author and Governor of the Universe* instead of the Word, *God*; which, with you, amounts to the same.

I am

I am the Lord, and there is none elſe; there is no Author and Governor of the Univerſe *beſides me*, Iſ. 45. 5.	*The Word was* Author and Governor of the Univerſe, *Joh.* 1. 1.
Is there an Author and Governor of the Univerſe *beſides me? yea, there is no* Author, *&c.* beſides me, *Iſa.* 44. 8.	*Chriſt came, who is over all,* Author and Governor of the Univerſe, *bleſſed for ever*, Rom. 9. 5.

I hope you ſee plainly how the Texts, in the two oppoſite Columns, confront and contradict each other; and that two *Authors and Governors of the Univerſe*, whom you ſuppoſe two diſtinct ſeparate Beings, are as plainly *two Gods*, as if it were ſaid ſo *in Terms*. For, indeed, there's no Difference more than that of putting the *Definition* for the Thing *defined*. But you have an Evaſion after; That They are not two *ſupreme Beings*. And what if They are not? Are They not ſtill two Authors and Governors of the Univerſe? And is not every ſuch *Author and Governor*, by your own Account, a God? This pretence then comes too late. Or admitting that *Supreme* muſt be added to Author and Governor, to make a true Definition of God; then *Author and Governor of the Univerſe*, without *Supreme*, is not ſufficient to denominate a Perſon God; and

and ſo you *ungod* the Second Perſon; and what you gave with one Hand, you take away with the other.

What you ſhould have ſaid, is, (for it is what you really mean) that there are *two Gods*; one *Supreme*, and the other *Subordinate:* Which being a Propoſition utterly repugnant to the Texts of *Iſaiah*, and to the whole Tenor of Scripture, and to all Antiquity, you do not, I ſuppoſe, care to ſpeak it at length. I have before endeavoured to expoſe this notion of *two Gods*; one *Supreme*, and the other *Inferior*; and have ſhown it to be unreaſonable and unſcriptural. I may add, that if there really be *two Gods*, (*Supreme* and *Inferior*) in the *proper Scriptural* Senſe of the Word, the Good Fathers of the three firſt Centuries argued againſt the Heathen *Polytheiſm* upon a very falſe Principle, and died Martyrs for an Error; the Angel in the Revelations may ſeem to have impoſed upon St. *John* with an erroneous Maxim, *Rev.* 19. 10. our Savior's Anſwer to the Devil to have been defective, and not pertinent, *Luk.* 4. 8. and the many Declarations of the *Unity* ſcattered through the Old Teſtament to be unintelligible and inſignificant. But this ſhall be more diſtinctly explain'd, when I come to the Argument concerning Worſhip.

Here let me only ask you, where does the Scripture give you the leaſt Intimation of *two* true Gods? Where does it furniſh you with

with any ground for the Diſtinction of a *Soveraign* and an *Inferior* Deity? What Foundation can you find for adding *Supreme* whereever the Scripture ſays abſolutely there is but *one* God? You are apt to complain of us, for adding to the Text; and for pretending to ſpeak plainer than the Holy Spirit has dictated; why do you *add* here, without any Warrant? If the Sacred Writers intended to limit the Senſe by *Supreme*, why could not They, in one place at leaſt, among many, have ſaid ſo, and have told it us as plainly as Dr. *Clarke* and you do? I argue indeed here *ad Hominem* only; and let it have juſt as much force with you, as the ſame way of Arguing, when you take it up in your turn, ought to have with us. But farther; what account can you give of your leaving Room for *inferior Deities*, when the Reaſon of the thing, the drift ſcope and deſign of the Scripture ſeems plainly to have been to exclude, not other *Supremes* only, or other *Independent* Deities (which few have been weak enough to ſuppoſe) but other *leſſer*, *inferior*, and *dependent* Divinities? Beſides, God has declared that *He will not give his Glory to another*, If. 42. 8.--48. 11. This you ſay *has no difficulty*. How ſo, I beſeech you? It ſeems to me a very great difficulty in your Scheme. You add, that *his Glory is, his being the one ſupreme independent Cauſe and Original of all Things or Beings.* Now, I thought it was his *peculiar* Glory to be

be truly *God*, and to be acknowledged as ſuch, excluſive of other Gods. This, I am ſure, is what the *one God* inculcates and inſiſts upon, very particularly, in the Old Teſtament. He diſcovers Himſelf to be a *jealous* God, and looks upon it as the higheſt Indignity to have any admitted as Partners and Sharers with Him. All Acts of Worſhip, all Homage, Service, Adoration, and Sacrifice, He claims, He challenges as his due; and due to Him only; and that becauſe He *only* is *God*. Now put the Caſe of *another God*; another *Author and Governor of the Univerſe:* That other will have a Share, and divide, tho' unequally, with Him in Glory. Was this then the meaning of *Iſa.* 42. 8. *I will not give* All *my Glory to another*? I will have the *greater Share* in every Thing? How conſiſtent might this be with the Worſhip of inferior Deities, or with the rankeſt *Polytheiſm*? For many of the Pagans themſelves paid their higheſt Veneration to the one ſupreme God; only they defiled his Worſhip with a multitude of inferior Deities; they gave not God the *ſole* Glory; but admitted others as Sharers and Partners with Him. You add, that *whatever divine Honour is juſtly given to any other, redounds ultimately to the Glory of Him, who commanded it to be given.*

But what if God, who beſt knows *what redounds to his Glory*, has already and beforehand engroſs'd all *divine Honour* to Himſelf, as being the only God, and the *ſole Author and*

and Governor of the Universe? Then all others are precluded from receiving any *divine Honour*; and there's no more Room left for God's *commanding* it, than there is for his confronting and contradicting Himself. But more of this hereafter, under the Head of *Worship*. I shall close this Article with *Grotius*'s Comment upon the Text which we have been considering. The meaning of it is, says He, "* That God will take severe Vengeance on "those who give that *Name* which belongs to "Him, to *Bel*, *Nebo*, *Merodach*, and Others, "which by *Nature are no Gods*.

* Vult enim dicere, se Vindicaturum severe in Eos qui Nomen, quod Ipsius est, dant Belo, Neboni, Meraducho, & Aliis τοῖς μὴ φύσει ὖσι Θεοῖς.

QUERY

QUERY V.

Whether Dr. Clarke's *pretence, that the* Authority *of Father and Son being* One, *tho' They are two diſtinct Beings, makes Them not to be two Gods*, As a King upon the Throne and his Son adminiſtring the Father's Government, are not two Kings; *be not trifling and inconſiſtent*? For, *if the King's Son be not a King, He cannot truly be called* King; *if He is, then there are* two Kings. So, *if the Son be not* God *in the Scripture-Notion of* God, *He cannot* truly *be called* God; *and then how is the Doctor conſiſtent with Scripture, or with Himſelf? But if the Son be* truly God, *there are* two Gods *upon the Doctor's Hypotheſis, as plainly as that* one *and* one *are* Two: *And ſo all the Texts of* Iſaiah *cited above, beſides others, ſtand full and clear againſt the Doctor's Notion.*

YOU *truſt*, it ſeems, that *upon a ſecond Conſideration* of this fifth Query, *The Objector* himſelf *will not think it very pertinent or concluſive.* But I can ſee no Reaſon for your being ſo ſanguine upon it. For, as an Argument ſo plain and ſtrong, needs not ſo much as a *ſecond* Conſideration; ſo if the Objector were to conſider it ever ſo often, He could not but think it to be, as He finds it, both

both very *pertinent* and very *concluſive*. You add, that *He will not ask, a ſecond Time, whether one divine Perſon exerciſing the Authority of another, to whom He is ſubordinate, and by whom He is ſent, proves that the two Perſons are two Gods.*

But let me intreat you, in a Subject of this Importance, not to trifle at this rate; talking backwards and forwards, ſaying and unſaying, aſſerting and then recanting, and contradicting your ſelf. What is Dr. *Clarke*'s Intention, and what is your's, in inſiſting ſo much on the *relative* Senſe of the word God, but to find *a ſalvo* for the *Divinity* of the Son; that He may be acknowledged, conſiſtently with your Hypotheſis, to be *truly, really, properly* God? Read but over again what you your ſelf have written (*p.* 113.) and then deny this if you can. Well then; if the Son, a diſtinct ſeparate Being, be *truly* and *really* God; and if the Father be ſo too, what can be plainer than that there are, upon your *Hypotheſis, two Gods?* But you ſay, one is *Supreme*, the other *Subordinate*. I underſtand it; I conſider it: And do not you allow that a *ſubordinate* Being may be *properly* God? Do not you expreſly plead and contend for it? Is it not *eſſential* in Dr. *Clarke*'s Scheme, and Your's too? What mean you then to deny that there are *two Gods?* Can you deny it, without recanting all that you had ſaid before; without ſtriking out every *ſubordinate* Being, from being *truly* and *properly* God;

God, without diſowning the very Principle upon which you aſſert the *Son* to be *God*; in ſhort, without manifeſtly confronting and condemning your ſelf? I do not charge you with aſſerting two *ſupreme* Gods: But I do charge you with holding two Gods, one *Supreme*, another *Inferior*; two real and true Gods, according to the Scripture-Notion of the Word, God, as explain'd by your ſelf. This you cannot truly and ſincerely, you ſhould not otherwiſe, deny: And therefore, inſtead of ſhifting it off, your Buſineſs ſhould be to maintain your Aſſertion, and to reconcile it, as far as poſſible, to Scripture, Antiquity, and Reaſon. I am ſenſible, ſomething may be pleaded, having ſeen what has been pleaded, for the Notion of *Two Gods*, as you underſtand it. But, I think, it is upon ſuch Principles, as will leave you no Pretence, from Scripture, to object *Tritheiſm* to others; nor any juſt ground for inſiſting, as you generally do, upon the ſtrict Force of the *excluſive* Terms, in order to *ungod* the Son. I will not however anticipate what you may have to ſay farther on this Head; nor what may be pertinently replied to it. Let me ſee firſt, how far you will, in good earneſt, eſpouſe the Notion of two Gods: In the Interim, I may fairly leave you to conſider of it. I ſhall be content, at preſent, to follow you in the way that you are in; endeavoring to clear your ſelf of the charge of aſſerting two Gods, and yet, all the while, pleading for a ſubordinate God.

To countenance your Notion, you produce, [a] after the Learned Doctor, the Authority of *Tertullian*; the same *Tertullian*, whom I have quoted above [b] as declaring expressly against any such vain Imagination, as that of a *subordinate* God; and throwing it off as a *Pagan* Dream: The same that says, the *Divinity* has no *Degrees*, being *one* only. Will you bring Him for a Voucher so directly against Himself? True, He uses the *similitude of a King upon a Throne, and a Son administring his Father's Kingdom:* But to a very different purpose from what you would have it serve. The Objection against more Persons than one in the Godhead (as *Tertullian* resolves it) was, that the *Authority* would not be *one*; that there would not be *unicum Imperium:* see the place in the [c] Margin. The *similitude* is pertinent to show how the *Authority*, or *Government*, may be *one* in the Hands of *several* Persons. But if

a *Script. Doctr.* p. 333. b *See Qu.* 3. p. 54.

c *Monarchiam,* inquiunt, tenemus. Et ita sonum vocaliter exprimunt Latini, etiam Opici, ut putes Illos tam bene intelligere *Monarchiam,* quam enuntiant. Sed *Monarchiam* sonare student Latini; & Oeconomiam intelligere nolunt etiam Græci. At Ego, si quid utriusque Linguæ præcerpsi, *Monarchiam* nihil aliud significare scio, quam *Singulare & Unicum Imperium:* non tamen præscribere *Monarchiam,* ideo quia Unius sit, Eum, cujus sit, aut Filium non habere, aut Ipsum se sibi Filium feciſſe, aut Monarchiam suam non per quos velit administrare. Atquin, nullam dico *Dominationem* ita unius sui esse, ut non etiam per alias proximas Personas administretur ——— Si vero & Filius fuerit ei, cujus *Monarchia* sit, non statim dividi eam, & *Monarchiam* esse desinere, si particeps ejus adsumatur & Filius. *Contr. Prax.* c. 3. p. 502.

The Sense of this Passage is very clear: The Praxeans, *(I suppose taking advantage of this; that the Church had always rejected* Tria Principia, *and* τρεῖς ἀνάρχους*) pleaded for Themselves, and against a*

you

you ask *Tertullian*, how Father and Son can be reputed *one God*; He tells you in the [a] Chapter before, and in that very Passage which the Doctor quotes, that it is by *Unity* of *Substance* and *Original*. *Unity* of *Authority*, and *Unity* of *Godhead*, are, with *Tertullian*, distinct Things; however you may please to confound Them: God and his Angels have, according to Him, *one Authority*; but He does not therefore say, that the Angels are *Gods*; or that, if They were, there would still be but *one God*.

[b] *Athenagoras* makes use of the same *Similitude* for the same purpose with *Tertullian*; to illustrate the Unity of *Authority* and Power common to Father and Son; not the Unity of *Godhead*. It was the [c] *Government divine*, which He undertook, in some measure, to illustrate, by That Comparison of a *King* and his *Son* (which however would argue an *Equality* of *Nature*, contrary to your Tenets.) But as to Unity of *Godhead*, He resolves it into [d] other Principles, the very same with *Ter-*

real *Trinity*; *μοναρχίαν tenemus.* Tertullian *tells them, that They misunderstood μοναρχία.* (*As it might signify* unum principium, *He had answered the Objection before*, c. 2.) *Here He says, it signifies only* one Authority; *and He shows that, taken in that Sense, it was no just Objection against a Trinity of Persons. Thus, having maintain'd, first,* Unity *of* Principle, *and afterwards* Unity *of* Authority; *He sufficiently guarded the Doctrine of the* Trinity, *against the Cavils of* Praxeas.

a Unus omnia, dum ex uno omnia, per Substantiæ scilicet Unitatem, *p.* 501.

Filium non aliunde deduco, sed de Substantia Patris, *c.* 4. *p* 502.

b Legat. c. 15. p. 63. c ἐπιτροπὴν βασιλείαν.

d *p.* 38, 39.—96.

tullian's; Namely, *Unity of Subſtance*, and *Original*, making the Holy Ghoſt (and the reaſon is the ſame for the Son) to be a Subſtantial * *Emanation* from the Father, as *Light* from *Fire*. The common Anſwer to the Charge of *Tritheiſm*, or *Ditheiſm*, as well of the *Poſt-Nicene*, as *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, was, that there is but one *Head*, *Root*, *Fountain*, *Father* of all; not in reſpect of *Authority* only, but of *Subſtance* alſo; as *Tertullian* before expreſſes it: *Non aliunde deduco, ſed de Subſtantia Patris*. This was the concurrent Senſe of † All in general; and into this chiefly they reſolved the Unity of *Godhead*; as they muſt needs do, ſince they believed *God* to be a Word denoting *Subſtance*, not *Dominion* only; and one *Divinity*, Θεότης, was with Them the ſame Thing as *one divine Subſtance*. The learned Doctor, after his manner of Citing, ‡ produces, I think, Thirteen Vouchers, (Ten Antient; Three Modern) for his Notion of the Unity. *Tertullian*, *Athenagoras*, and *Novatian* (Three of Them) evidently reſolve the Unity, as before obſerved, into *Communion of Subſtance*. *Juſtin*, *Athanaſius*, *Hilary*, *Baſil*, *Pearſon*, *Bull*, *Payne*, (Seven more) moſt of Them, in the very Paſſages which the Doctor cites; All of them, ſomewhere or other, are known to reſolve it into *Sonſhip*, or Unity of *Principle*; either of which

* Νοῦς, λόγος, σοφία, υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ ἀπόῤῥοια, ὡς φῶς ἀπὸ πυρὸς, τὸ πνεῦμα, p. 96.

† *Some pretended Exceptions will be conſidered in another Place*, Qu. 23.

‡ *Script. Doctr.* p. 334, 335, &c.

comes

comes to the same with the former. None of these Authors so understood the Father to be one God, as to exclude the Son from being *one God* with Him, in Nature, Substance, and Perfection: Nor would they have scrupled to call Father and Son together, one God; most of them doing it expressly, all implicitely.

Origen, another of the Doctor's Authors, resolves the Unity into Communion of Godhead, in the [a] Passage cited. Θεότης is the word He uses; [b] generally, if not constantly, signifying *Substance* in that very Comment from whence the Citation is taken; agreeably to the most usual Sense of Θεὸς, in the Ante-Nicene Writers; and of *Divinitas*, in *Tertullian*; and of Θεότης in other [c] Authors.

Lactantius, the *twelfth* of the Number, would have spoken fully to our purpose, in the very [d] Chapter refer'd to, if the Doctor would have suffered Him. He would have told us (however unhappy He may otherwise be in his Explications of That Mystery) that Father and Son are *one Substance*, and *one God*; so far, at least, contrary to what the learned Doctor cites him for. There remains only *Eu-*

a Comm. in Joh. *p.* 46. b *See* ibid. *p.* 35. 133. 154. 228. 262.

c Epist. Synod. Antioch. Labb. Tom. 1. *p.* 847. Eusebius *Comm. in Psalm.* p. 323. 592. *& in Isa.* p. 375. 382. 551. Athanas. passim. Epiphan. Hæres. 64. c. 8.

d Una utrique mens, unus Spiritus, *una Substantia* est; sed Ille quasi exuberans Fons est; Hic tanquam defluens ex eo Rivus: Ille tanquam Sol; Hic quasi Radius a Sole porrectus. Ad *utramque Personam* referens intulit, *& Prater me non est Deus*; cum possit dicere, *prater nos:* sed Fas non erat plurali numero Separationem Tantæ Necessitudinis fieri. *l.* 4. *c.* 29. *p.* 403, 404.

ſebius, whoſe Expreſſions are bold and free; and ſo far favourable to the Doctor, as they are different from thoſe of the *Catholicks* of his own Time, or of the Times before, and after. If they are really to be underſtood, ſo as to exclude the *Son* from being *one God* with the Father, they *ungod* the Son; and contain plain *Arianiſm*. But, perhaps they may admit of ſuch a favourable excuſe as, * *Gelaſius* tells us, *Euſebius*, in effect, made for Himſelf, in reſpect of any uncautious Expreſſions, which, in the warmth of Diſpute, or out of his great Zeal againſt *Sabellianiſm*, had dropp'd from Him: *That He did not intend Them in the* (impious) *Senſe of* Arius; *but had only been too careleſs and negligent in his Expreſſions.* One may be the more inclined to believe it, ſince He admitted, at other Times (as I have obſerved above) *one God in three Perſons:* and elſewhere ſpeaks very Orthodoxly of the Holy undivided Trinity, making the †*Trinity* (not the *Father only*) the Ἀρχὴ, the Head and Principle of all Things; and illuſtrating the *Equality* of the Perſons by a very handſome Similitude. But to return to the Learned Doctor: In the ‡ Cloſe of this Article, He has a peculiar

* Οὐ μὴν κατὰ τὴν ἀσεβῆ ἐκείνῃ ἔννοιαν, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἀπεριέργου ἁπλότητος. Gelaſ. l. 2. de Syn. Nic. c. 1. p. 11.

† Εἰκὼν δὲ ταῦτα μυσικῆς καὶ πναγίας, ἣ βασιλικῆς τελάδος. ἡ τ ἀνάρχῳ καὶ ἀγενήτῳ φύσεως ὑρτημένη, τῆς τ γενετῶν ἁπάντων οὐσίας τὰ σπέρματα, καὶ τὰς λόγους, καὶ τὰς αἰτίας, ἀπίληφε. καὶ τριάδος μὲ δύναμις εἰκότως ἂν ἄρα παντὸς ἀρχὴ νομισθείη. Orat. de Laud. Conſtant. p. 511. Ed. Valeſ.

‡ Script. Doctr. *p.* 349.

Turn,

Turn, which ſhould be taken notice of. *The Scholaſtick Writers*, ſays He, *in later Ages, have put this Matter* (meaning the Unity of the Godhead) *upon another Foot:* That is, different from what Himſelf, and perhaps *Euſebius* in thoſe Paſſages, had put it upon. They have not, it ſeems, put it upon *a real, proper, numerical individuality*, as the Learned Doctor would have had them do. They do not make the Godhead μονοπρόσωπον, one ſingle *Hypoſtaſis*; which, in the main, is all one with the *Sabellian* Singularity.

The Reader ſhould be told, that thoſe *Scholaſtick* Writers are as old as *Tertullian*, *Irenæus*, or *Athenagoras*; which brings it up almoſt to the middle of the Second Century. So early, at leaſt, Father and Son together have been *called*, and all along *believed* to be *one God*. Let but the Reader underſtand, and take along with Him, what I have now obſerved; and I ſhall not differ with you about Names. *Scholaſtick* may ſtand for *Catholick*, as I perceive it often does with you alſo, if you think the Catholick Faith may, under that borrow'd Name, be more ſafely, or more ſucceſsfully attacked. The *Scholaſtick* Notion then, which has prevailed for Fifteen Centuries at leaſt, is, that Father and Son are *one God:* Your's, on the other Hand, is, that the Father is one God, and the Son another God: And I am to convince you, if I can, that one God, and another God, make two Gods. You

ask me ſeriouſly, * *whether* Herod *the great, was not King of* Judea, *tho' the Jews* (that is, when the Jews) *had no King but* Cæſar? I anſwer, He was not: For, *Herod* the Great had been dead above Thirty Years before; and the *Jews* had really *no King but* Cæſar, when they ſaid ſo. However, if there had been one King under another King, there would have been *two Kings*. The ſame I ſay for one *God* under another *God*; they make *two Gods*. You ask, next, *whether there were more Kings of* Perſia *than one, tho' the King of* Perſia *was King of Kings?* I ſhall not diſpute whether, *King of Kings*, was Titular only to the *Kings of Perſia*, or whether They had other Kings under Them. I ſhall only ſay thus: Either the *ſuppoſed* Kings of *Perſia* were Kings of *Perſia*, or They were not: If They were; then there were *more Kings of* Perſia *than one:* If They were not *Kings of Perſia*; They ſhould not be ſo called. To apply this to our preſent purpoſe; either there are two *Authors and Governors of the Univerſe*, that is, *two Gods*; or there are not: If there are, why do you deny it of Either? If there are not, why do you affirm it of Both?

After all, pleaſe to take Notice, that I do not diſpute againſt the notion of one King under another; a petty King under a Supreme. There's no difficulty at all in the Conception of it. But what I inſiſt upon, is this: That a

* Pag. 45.

great

great King and a *little* King make *two Kings*; or elſe one of Them is *no King*, contrary to the Suppoſition. The ſame I ſay of a *ſupreme* and a *ſubordinate* God, that They make *Two Gods*; or elſe, one of Them is *no God*, contrary to the Suppoſition.

QUERY VI.

Whether the ſame Characteriſticks, eſpecially ſuch eminent ones, can reaſonably be underſtood of two diſtinct Beings, and of one Infinite and Independent, the other Dependent and Finite?

TEXTS, proving an Unity of divine Attributes in Father and Son, applied

To the one God.	To the Son.
Thou, even Thou only knoweſt the Hearts of all the Children of Men, Kings 8. 39.	*He knew all Men*, &c. Joh. 2. 24. *Thou knoweſt all Things*, Joh. 16. 30. *Which knoweſt the Hearts of all Men*, Acts 1. 24.
I the Lord ſearch the Heart; I try the Reins, Jer. 17. 10.	*I am He that ſearcheth the Reins and the Heart*, Rev. 2. 3.
I am the firſt, and I am the laſt, and beſides me there is no God, Iſa. 44. 6.	*I am the firſt, and I am the laſt*, Rev. 1. 17.

I am

I am A *and* Ω, *the beginning and the end*, Rev. 1. 8.

King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, 1 Tim. 6. 15.

The mighty God, If. 10. 21.

Lord over all, Rom. 10. 12.

I am A *and* Ω, *the beginning and the end*, Rev. 22. 13.

Lord of Lords, and King of Kings, Rev. 17. 14. --- 19. 16.

The mighty God, If. 9. 6.

He is Lord of all, Act. 10. 36. *Over all God bleſſed*, &c. Rom. 9. 5.

In this ſixth Query (for ſo I chuſe to make it, thinking That method moſt convenient, on ſeveral Accounts) are couched two Arguments for the Son's being the *one true God*, as well as the Father.

The Firſt is: That the *Characteriſticks*, applied to the one true God, are applied likewiſe to the Son: which Conſideration *alone* is of great force.

The Second is: That the Attributes here applied to the Son, are ſuch *eminent* ones, that we might ſafely conclude they belong to no *Creature*, but to God only.

How ſhall we know, who, or what the one God is; or what Honour, and to whom, due; but by ſuch Marks, Notes, and diſtinguiſhing Characters as are given us of Him in Scripture? If thoſe are equally applied to two, or more *Perſons*, the Honour muſt go along with the *Attributes*; and the *Attributes* infer an equality

lity of Nature and Subſtance, to ſupport Them. In a Word; if divine *Attributes* belong to each Perſon, each Perſon muſt be God; and if God, ſince God is one, the ſame God. This is the Sum of the Argument: Now let us ſee what Anſwer you give to it.

You admit that the Attributes, ſpecified in the Texts, belong to Both: only you obſerve, that *all Powers and Attributes are ſaid to be the* Father's only, *becauſe they belong to Him* primarily, or originally, *as the Self-exiſtent Cauſe* *. This I can readily admit, as well as you; provided only, the word, *Cauſe*, be interpreted to a juſt, ſober, and catholick Senſe (as the *Greek* Writers eſpecially have underſtood it) and *Self-exiſtent* be interpreted, as it ſhould be, *negatively*. You add, *our Lord* Jeſus Chriſt, *having all communicable divine Powers derived to Him, with his Being, from the Father, is ſaid to do the ſame things which the Father doth, and to be, in a ſubordinate Senſe, what the Father is.*

Here are many Things, in this Anſwer, liable to juſt Exception. Firſt, your uſing the word, *Divine*, in an improper Senſe. *Angelical* Powers are ſuch as are peculiar to *Angels*; and *divine* Powers ſuch as are proper to *God* only: But, here you underſtand them, in the ſame Senſe, as one might call any kingly Power, or Authority, *divine*, becauſe derived from God; and ſo any thing that comes from God, is, in your Senſe, *divine*. In the next

* Pag. 46. place,

place, you clog it farther with the Term, *communicable*, telling us that all *communicable* divine Powers, are derived to Chriſt Jeſus: whereas I contend, that the Attributes in the Text, are ſtrictly *divine*; and therefore *incommunicable* to any Creature. Next, you ſpeak of a *ſubordinate* Senſe, in which thoſe Attributes belong to Chriſt; which is the ſame as to ſay, (becauſe you mean ſo) that they belong not at all to Him. For, I ſuppoſe, *omniſcience*, or *eternity*, &c. in your *ſubordinate Senſe*, are very different from the other; and therefore are not the *ſame* Attributes. It were better to deny roundly, that the ſame Attributes belong to Both; and then we ſhould clearly apprehend each other. Laſtly, I obſerve to you, that you underſtand the word, *ſubordinate*, very differently from what Catholick Writers do, in this Controverſy; and therefore, inſtead of it, ſhould rather have ſaid, in a *reſtrain'd*, *limited* Senſe; which is your meaning, otherwiſe you contradict not me.

Now then, I muſt ask you, what ground or warrant you have from Scripture, or right reaſon, for putting *Reſtrictions* and *Limitations* upon the Texts applied to *Chriſt Jeſus*, more than to thoſe applied to the *one God*? The Expreſſions are equally general; and, *ſeemingly* at leaſt, equally extenſive. You are ſo ſenſible that you can give no ſolid Proof of a *reſtrain'd* and *limited* Senſe, that you do not ſo much as offer at it; but only covertly inſinuate your mean-

meaning, under dark and obſcure Terms. You ſpeak of *Subordination*, and quote *Fathers* for it; who underſtood it in the ſober and orthodox Senſe: If you agree with thoſe *Fathers*, you agree with me. But, do not uſe their venerable Names as a cover for what they never meant, but would have greatly abhor'd *. I allow the ſecond Perſon to be *ſubordinately wiſe*, *good*, *powerful*, &c. That is not the Queſtion between us: He is *ſapientia de ſapientia*; as *lumen de lumine*, and *Deus de Deo*. What I contend for farther, is, that his Attributes are *ſtrictly* divine, and his Perfections *infinite*. I prove it from hence; becauſe the Attributes which belong to the *one God*, and are therefore undoubtedly *Infinite*, belong to Him alſo; from whence it follows, that the *Godhead* belongs to Him too; and that there are more Perſons than one, in the *one God*. Whatever I can find, in your Anſwer, tending, in the leaſt, to invalidate this reaſoning, I ſhall take notice of; tho' you have been pleas'd to be very ſparing in this Article. You obſerve that *the exerciſe of theſe Attributes being finite, they do not neceſſarily infer an infinite Subject*. I underſtand not what you mean by the *exerciſe* of *Eternity* and *Omniſcience*, which are two of thoſe Attributes; nor how it can be *finite*, without an expreſs Contradiction;

* *The Teſtimonies, which you have cited from Dr.* Clarke, *I take no notice of; becauſe they have been already conſider'd by a learned Gentleman; and ſhown to be foreign to your purpoſe.* True Script. Doctr. Continu'd. *p.* 11.

nor

nor how either of them can be *exercis'd*, whatever you mean by it, but by an *infinite* Subject. As little do I understand how *infinite Power*, which, I presume, is what you chiefly allude to, must be *finite* in the *exercise* of it; as if there could not be an Act of *infinite* Power, or as if God could not do something which should infinitely exceed any finite Power. These Things very much want explaining; and so I leave them to your farther Thoughts.

The clearest Expression you have, under this Article, is this: *when Christ is stiled*, Lord of all, *see it explain'd*, Matt. 28. 18. and Ephes. 1. 22. where Christ Jesus is said to *have all power given Him*. Here, I think, I do understand your meaning; and am sorry to find that it falls so low. Would your * Predecessors in this Controversy, the Antient *Arians*, or *Eunomians*, have ever scrupled to acknowledge that our Blessed Saviour was *Lord over all*, long before his *Resurrection*, or even his *Incarnation?* That *He was Lord of all before his Resurrection*, is very plain from the Scriptures, which carry in them irrefragable Proofs of it. *By Him were all Things created that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, visible and invisible; whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers,*

* Antequam faceret Universa, omnium Futurorum Deus & Dominus, Rex & Creator erat Constitutus. Voluntate & præcepto (*Dei & Patris sui*) Cælestia & Terrestria, visibilia & invisibilia, Corpora & Spiritus, ex nullis existantibus, ut essent, sua virtute fecit. Serm. Arianor. apud August. *Tom.* 8. *p.* 622.

all

all Things were created by Him, and for Him; and He is before all Things, and by Him all Things conſiſt, Col. 1. 16, 17. *Thou Lord in the beginning haſt laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the works of thine Hands*, * Heb. 1. 10.

* *It is not without good Reaſon that we underſtand* Hebr. 1. 10. *of Chriſt.*

1. *The context it ſelf favors it. The Verſe begins with,* καὶ σὺ, *which properly refers to the ſame who was ſpoken of immediately before in the ſecond Perſon. The* σὲ *preceding and* σὺ *following, anſwer to each other. A change of Perſon, while the ſame way of ſpeaking is purſued, muſt appear unnatural.*

2. *The ſcope and intent of the Author was to ſet forth the Honour and Dignity of the Son above the Angels; and no Circumſtance could be more proper than that of his* Creating *the World.*

3. *If He had omitted it, He had ſaid leſs than Himſelf had done before, in Verſe the* 2d, *of which this ſeems to be Explanatory; and as He had brought Proofs from the Old Teſtament for ſeveral other Articles, nothing could be more proper or more pertinent, than to bring a Proof, from thence, of this alſo.*

4. *Declaring Him to be* Jehovah, *and* Creator *of the Univerſe might be very proper to ſhow that He was no* miniſtring Spirit, *but* σύνθρονον; *to* ſit at the right Hand of God, *which immediately follows.*

5. *To introduce a Paſſage here about God's* immutability *or* ſtability, *muſt appear very abrupt, and not pertinent; becauſe the Angels alſo, in their Order and Degree, reap the Benefit of God's* ſtability *and* immutability. *And the Queſtion was not about the* duration *and* continuance, *but about the* ſublimity *and* excellency *of their reſpective Natures and Dignities.*

6 *I may add, that this Senſe is very conſonant to* Antiquity; *which every where ſpeaks of the Son as Creator, and in as high and ſtrong Terms: ſuch as Theſe,* τεχνίτης, δημιουργὸς, ποιητὴς: ἀνθρώπων, ἀγγέλων, τῶ πάντων, τῶ ὅλων, τῦ κόσμου, *and the like; Teſtimonies whereof will occur hereafter.* Barnabas, *ſpeaking of the Sun in the Heavens, calls it* ἔργον χειρῶν αὐτοῦ, *meaning Chriſt; tho' there's ſome diſpute about the Reading: of which ſee* Grab. Not. in Bull. D. F. p. 23.

Theſe Conſiderations ſeem ſufficient to overthrow the Pretences of a late Writer, Examin. of Dr. *Bennet* on Trin. p. 40. *As to former Exceptions to this Verſe, They are conſider'd and confuted by Biſhop* Bull, Jud. Eccl. p. 43, *See alſo* Surenhuſ. in loc. p. 600.

Can

Can you imagine that the Son could be *Creator* and *Preſerver* of all Things from the Beginning; and yet not be *Lord over all* till after his Reſurrection? If this does not ſatisfy you, return to *Joh.* 1. 1. He was Θεὸς before the World was, by your own Acknowledgement; which being a word of *Office* and implying *Dominion*, He was certainly *Lord*, as ſoon as ever there was any Thing for Him to be *Lord* over. And when He came into the *World*, the *World* that *was made by Him*, (Joh. 1.10.) He *came unto his* own, (*Joh.*1.11.) Surely then, He was *Lord over all* long before his Reſurrection.

You will ask, it may be, what then is the meaning of thoſe Texts which you have quoted? How was *all Power given Him*, according to *Matt.* 28. 18? Or how were *all Things* then *put under His Feet*, according to *Epheſ.* 1. 22? Nothing is more eaſy than to anſwer you this. The Λόγος, or *Word*, was, from the Beginning, *Lord over all*; but the *God incarnate*, the Θεάνθρωπος, or *God-Man*, was not ſo, till after the Reſurrection. Then He received, in that Capacity, what He had ever enjoy'd in another. Then did He receive that *full Power*, in *both* Natures, which He had heretofore poſſeſs'd in *one* only. This is very handſomly repreſented by *Hermas*, in his *fifth Similitude:* where the * Son of God is introduced under a double Capacity, as *a Son*,

* *See* Bull. D. Fid. N. p. 38.

and

and as *a Servant*, in respect of his two Natures, *Divine* and *Human*.

"*The Father calling his Son and Heir whom "He loved, and such Friends as He was wont "to have in Council, He tells Them what "Commands He had laid upon his Servant; "and moreover what the Servant had done: "And they immediately congratulated that "Servant, for that He had received so full a "Testimony from his Lord.——(*Afterwards the* Father *adds*) "I will make Him my Heir "together with my Son.—— This design of "the Lord, both his Son and his Friends ap-"proved, namely, that this *Servant* should "be *Heir* together with his *Son*.

It is much to the same purpose that *Origen* says to *Celsus*. "† Let those our Accusers "(*who object to us our making a God of a* "*mortal Man*) know, that (this Jesus) whom "we believe to have been God, and the Son "of God, from the beginning; is no other

* (Pater) adhibito Filio quem carum & Hæredem habebat, & Amicis quos in Consilio advocabat; indicat eis quæ Servo suo facienda mandasset, quæ præterea Ille fecisset. At Illi protinus gratulati sunt Servo illi, quod tam plenum Testimonium Domini assecutus fuisset——— volo eum Filio meo facere cohæredem ——— Hoc consilium Domini, & Filius, & Amici ejus Comprobaverunt, ut fieret scilicet Hic Servus Cohæres Filio. *Herm. Past. Sim.* 5. *c.* 2. *p.* 104. *Cot. Edit.*

† Ἴστωσαν οἱ ἐγκαλοῦντες ὅτι ὃν μὲν νομίζομεν καὶ πεπείσμεθα ἀρχῆθεν εἶναι Θεὸν καὶ υἱὸν Θεοῦ, οὗτος ὁ αὐτολόγος ἐστὶ, καὶ ἡ αὐτοσοφία, καὶ ἡ αὐτοαλήθεια· Τὸ δὲ θνητὸν αὐτοῦ σῶμα, καὶ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ἐν αὐτῷ ψυχὴν, τῇ πρὸς ἐκεῖνο, οὐ μόνον κοινωνίᾳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑνώσει καὶ ἀνακράσει, τὰ μέγιστά φαμεν προσειληφέναι, καὶ τῆς ἐκείνου θειότητος κεκοινωνηκότα εἰς Θεὸν μεταβεβηκέναι. Orig. Contr. Cels. l. 3. p. 136, &c.

" than the Word it self, Truth it self, and " Wisdom it self: But we say farther that his " mortal Body, and the *human Soul* that was " therein, by means of their most intimate " Connexion to, and Union with *the Word*, " received the greatest Dignity imaginable, and " participating of his Divinity, were taken in- " to God. It is difficult to express the full force of this Passage, in *English:* But you may see the Original in the Margin.

From hence you may perceive, how easy it is to account for our Lord's having *all Power given Him*, after his Resurrection; given him in respect of his *Human Nature*, which was never so high exalted, nor assumed into such Power and Privilege, till that Time; having before been under a State of Affliction, and Humiliation. There is a notable Fragment of *Hippolytus* which *Fabricius* has lately given us in the Second Volume; and which is so full to our purpose, that I cannot forbear adding it to the former. Speaking of that famous Passage in the Epistle to the *Philippians*, c. 2. and particularly upon these Words: *Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him*, v. 9. He Comments upon it thus. * " He is said to be " *exalted*, as having wanted it before; but in " respect only of his *Humanity*; and He has " a Name *given* Him; as 'twere a Matter of " Favor, *which is above every Name* as the " Blessed (Apostle) *Paul* expresses it. But

* Hippolytus Vol. 2. p. 29. Fabric. Edit.

" in

" in Truth and Reality, this was not the *giv-*
" *ing* Him any Thing, which He *naturally*
" had not from the Beginning: so far from it,
" that we are rather to esteem it his returning
" to what He had in the Beginning * *essentially*,
" and unalterably; on which Account it is, that
" He, having condescended, οἰκονομικῶς, to put
" on the humble Garb of *Humanity*, said, *Fa-*
" *ther, glorify me with the Glory, which I*
" *had*, &c. For He was *always* invested with
" Divine-Glory, having been Co-existent with
" his Father before all Ages, and before all
" Time, and the Foundation of the World †.

I hope, this may suffice to convince you, how much you mistake; and how contrary your Sentiments are both to Scripture, and Catholick Antiquity, if you imagine that the Λόγος, or Word, then first began to be *Lord over all*, when that Honour was confer'd on the Man Christ Jesus.

* Οὐσιωδῶς καὶ ἀναποδλήτως.

† *I may add a Passage of* Novatian. Ac si de cœlo descendit Verbum Hoc, tanquam Sponsus ad Carnem, ut per Carnis adsumptionem *Filius Hominis* illuc posset ascendere, unde *Dei Filius*, Verbum, descenderat: Merito, dum per connexionem mutuam, & Caro Verbum Dei gerit, & Filius Dei Fragilitatem Carnis adsumit; Cum sponsa Carne Conscendens illuc unde sine Carne descenderat, *recipit jam claritatem illam, quam dum ante mundi Constitutionem habuisse ostenditur, Deus manifestissime Comprobatur.* Novat. c. 13.

QUERY VII.

Whether the Father's Omniſcience *and* Eternity *are not one and the ſame with the Son's, being alike deſcribed, and in the ſame Phraſes?* See the Texts above. *p.* 89.

YOUR Anſwer, *with reſpect to the Son's *Omniſcience*, is, *that He hath a relative Omniſcience communicated to Him from the Father; that He knows all Things relating to the Creation and Government of the Univerſe*; and that He is ignorant of the *Day of Judgment*.

The Son then, it ſeems, knows *all Things*, excepting that He is ignorant of many Things; and is *omniſcient* in ſuch a Senſe, as to know infinitely leſs, than one who is really *omniſcient*. Were it not better to ſay plainly, that He is not omniſcient, than to ſpeak of a *relative* Omniſcience, which is really no *Omniſcience*; unleſs an Angel be *omniſcient*, or a Man *omniſcient*, becauſe He knows all Things which He knows? What Ground do you find in Scripture, or Antiquity, for your Diſtinction of *abſolute* and *relative* Omniſcience? Where is it ſaid, that He knows all Things *relating to his Office*, and no more? Or how can he be ſo much as *omniſcient*, in this low Senſe, if He knows not, or knew not, the preciſe time

* Pag. 48.

of

of the Day of Judgment; a Thing which, one would imagine, ſhould belong to his Office as much as any? *Matt.* 24. 36. as well as *Mark* 13. 32. is plainly meant only of the *human Nature*; and is to the ſame effect with *Luk.* 2. 52. *That He increas'd in Wiſdom*, which cannot be literally underſtood of the Λόγος with any tolerable conſiſtency, even upon the *Arian Hypotheſis* *. You tell us farther, that *All the Ante-Nicene Writers underſtand by theſe two Texts, that our* Lord *as the* Λόγος, *or Son of God, did not then know the Day of Judgment*, (p. 49.) This is very *new* indeed; If you have read the *Ante-Nicene* Writers; you muſt know better: if you have not; how unaccountable a thing is it to talk thus confidently without Book? If what you ſay was true, we ſhould, without delay, give you up all theſe Writers to a Man; and never more pretend to quote any *Ante-Nicene* Fa-

* *A late Writer acquaints us, in the Name of Dr.* Clarke *and the* Arians, (*I preſume, without their leave*) "*that the* Word really "emptied *it ſelf, and became like the Rational Soul of* another Man, "*which is* limited *by the Bodily Organs; and is, in a manner,* dor- "mant *in Infancy; and that the* Word *may be* deprived *of its for-* "*mer extraordinary Abilities* —— in reality, *and* grow *in* Wiſdom, "*as* others *do. This is making the* Λόγος, *That greateſt and beſt of Beings, (upon the* Arian *Scheme) next to God Himſelf, become a Child in underſtanding; tho' once wiſe enough to Frame, and Govern the whole Univerſe. The Author calls it, (I think, very* profanely) The true and great Myſtery of Godlineſs, God manifeſt in Fleſh. *One would think, inſtead of* manifeſt, *it ſhould have been,* confined, lock'd up *in Fleſh; which is the Author's own Interpretation of this* Myſtery, (p. 16.) *What deſign He could have in all This, I know not; unleſs He conſider'd what Turn* Arianiſm *took, ſoon after its Revival at the Reformation.* See Exam. of Dr. *Bennet* on the Trin. p. 15, 16.

ther, in favour of the preſent Orthodoxy. But as the Point is of great Moment, we muſt require ſome Proofs of it: For, writing of Hiſtory by Invention, is really *Romancing*. You cite *Irenæus* from * Dr. *Clarke*, who could find no other: or elſe we ſhould have heard of it from the firſt Hand. And yet you cry out, *All*; which is more than the learned Doctor pretended to ſay; who had his Thoughts about Him; and would not have let ſlip any fair advantage to the Cauſe which He eſpouſes.

But has the Doctor really proved that *Irenæus* meant ſo? Perhaps not: And then your *All*, which was but *one*, is reduced to *none*. Two Things the Doctor, or you, ſhould have proved: Firſt, That *Irenæus* underſtood thoſe Texts of the Λόγος, or Word, in that Capacity. And Secondly, That He ſuppoſed Him *literally* Ignorant of the Day of Judgment. The Doctor knew full well what Solutions had been given of the difficulty ariſing from this Paſſage. Yet He barely recites *Irenæus*'s Words; and neither attempts to prove that ſuch was his Senſe, nor to diſprove it. You indeed do obſerve, from ſome *learned Perſon*, that this Paſſage of *Irenæus will admit of no Evaſion. For, He evidently ſpeaks not of the* Son of Man, *but of the* Son of God; *even of That Son with whom, as it follows, in omnibus Pater communicat.* Let this have its due Weight: The Argument may look ſo far plauſible on that

* Script. Doctr. p. 146.

ſide:

ſide: But let the other ſide be heard too, before we determine. [a] Biſhop *Bull* has given ſome Reaſons, and weighty ones too, to ſhow, that, if *Irenæus* attributed any Ignorance to Chriſt, He did it in reſpect of his *Human Nature* only. His Reaſons are.

1. Becauſe *Irenæus*, in the very ſame Chapter, [b] aſcribes abſolute Omniſcience to the *divine Nature* of Chriſt.

2. Becauſe He every where elſe ſpeaks of the Son, as of one perfectly acquainted with the *Nature*, and *Will*, of the Father.

3. Becauſe the ſame [c] *Irenæus* upbraids the *Gnoſticks* for their Folly, in aſcribing any Degree of Ignorance to their pretended *Sophia*, or Wiſdom. How then could He imagine that the true *Sophia*, Wiſdom it ſelf, could be ignorant of any Thing?

4. Becauſe the ſame *Irenæus* [d] uſes an Argument againſt the *Valentinians*, who pretended

a Def. F. N. *p.* 82. *Comp.* Brev. Animadv. in G. Cl. *p.* 1056.

b Spiritus Salvatoris, qui in eo eſt, Scrutatur omnia, & Altitudines Dei, *l.* 2. *c.* 28. *p.* 158.

c *See l.* 2. *c.* 18. *p.* 140. *Iren.* Quomodo autem non vanum eſt, quod etiam *Sophiam* ejus dicunt in ignorantia ——— fuiſſe? Hæc enim aliena ſunt a *Sophia*, & contraria ——— ubi enim eſt *Improvidentia* & *Ignorantia* utilitatis, ibi *Sophia* non eſt.

d *Iren. l.* 2. *c.* 25. *p.* 152. *Ed. Bened.* In quantum minor eſt, ab eo qui factus non eſt & qui ſemper idem eſt, ille qui hodie factus eſt & initium facturæ accepit: in tantum, ſecundum *ſcientiam* & ad *inveſtigandum cauſas omnium*, minorem eſſe eo qui fecit. Non enim infectus es, O Homo, neque ſemper co-exiſtebas Deo, ſicut proprium ejus Verbum: Sed propter eminentem Bonitatem ejus, nunc initium facturæ accipiens, ſenſim diſcis a Verbo diſpoſitiones Dei, qui Te fecit. *The whole Paſſage is fuller to the Point.*

to know all Things, which plainly ſuppoſes that Chriſt is *omniſcient*. The Argument is This. You are not *eternal* and *uncreated*, as the Son of God is; and therefore cannot pretend to be *omniſcient*, as He is.

It might have concern'd you to anſwer theſe Reaſons, and to make the good Father, at leaſt, conſiſtent with Himſelf, before you lay claim to his Authority for your ſide of the Queſtion. However, I am perſuaded, that, as Biſhop *Bull* is very right in determining that *Irenæus* could not mean to aſcribe any degree of Ignorance to the Λόγος, or *divine Nature*, of Chriſt; ſo, you are right ſo far, in the other Point, that *Irenæus* is to be underſtood of the Λόγος, in what He ſays. And now the Queſtion will be, whether He really aſcribes *Ignorance* to Him, or only ſeems to do ſo, to an unattentive Reader.

Irenæus's Words, I conceive, will moſt naturally bear this following Interpretation, or Paraphraſe. " * If any one inquires on what " Account the Father who communicates in

* Si quis exquirat cauſam, propter quam in omnibus Pater communicans Filio, ſolus ſcire & Horam & Diem a Domino manifeſtatus eſt; neque aptabilem magis, neque decentiorem, nec ſine periculo alteram quam hanc inveniat, in præſenti, (quoniam enim Solus Verax Magiſter eſt Dominus) ut diſcamus per Ipſum ſuper omnia eſſe Patrem. Etenim *Pater*, ait, *Major me eſt*. Et ſecundum Agnitionem itaque præpoſitus eſſe Pater annuntiatus eſt a Domino noſtro; ad hoc, ut & nos, in quantum in figura hujus mundi ſumus, perfectam ſcientiam, & tales quæſtiones concedamus Deo: & ne forte quærentes *&c.* *Iren. l.* 2. *c.* 28. *p.* 158, 159.

He had ſaid before.

Dominus, ipſe Filius Dei, ipſum Judicii Diem & Horam con-

" *all*

" *all Things* with the Son, (*and consequently* " *in* all Knowledge, *and particularly in that* " *of the Day of Judgment*) is yet here *set* " *forth* as the only Person knowing that Day " and Hour; He cannot, so far as I at present " apprehend, find any fitter or more decent, " or indeed any other safe Answer than this " (considering that our Lord is a Teacher of " Truth, *and must mean something by it*) that " it was to instruct us, as from Himself, that " the Father is *above all*, according to what " He says elsewhere, *for the Father is greater* " *than I*. And therefore the Father is declared " to have the Priority and Preference in respect " of Knowledge, by our Lord Himself, for an " Example to us; that we also, while we live " and converse here below, may learn to refer " the Perfection of Knowledge, and all intricate " Questions to God.

The design of *Irenæus* was to check the vain Presumption, and Arrogance of the *Gnosticks*, pretending to search into the deep Things of God. And the Argument He had us'd was this; that our Lord Himself was pleas'd to refer the knowledge of the Day of Judgment to the Father only; as it were on purpose to Teach us, that while we converse here below, it becomes

cessit scire solum Patrem, manifestè dicens: *de Die autem illo & Hora nemo scit, neque Filius, nisi Pater solus.* Si igitur scientiam diei illius, Filius non erubuit referre ad Patrem, sed dixit quod verum est; neque nos erubescamus, quæ sunt in quæstionibus majora secundum nos, reservare Deo, *p.* 158.

us not to pretend to high Things; but to leave the deep Things of God, to God alone. This is his Argument, and a very good one it is. But the good Father apprehending that what He had ſaid of our bleſſed Saviour, might be liable to Exception, and be miſunderſtood; comes afterwards to explain his Senſe more at large. He is ſenſible of the danger of aſcribing any thing like *Ignorance* to our bleſſed Lord, on one hand; and as ſenſible of the danger of *contradicting* the Text on, the other. *Quoniam enim Solus Verax Magiſter eſt Dominus, in as much as what Chriſt has ſaid muſt be true*; in ſome Senſe or other. Dr. *Clarke* ſlipp'd over theſe Words in his Tranſlation of the Paſſage, I ſuppoſe by inadvertency: But they may ſerve to give light to the reſt. For the difficulty lay here: How can it be true that the Father communicates in all Things, and conſequently in the knowledge of the Day of Judgment, to the Son; and yet our Saviour ſay true, in *aſcribing* that particular knowledge to the Father only? His anſwer is, that we are thereby taught to refer every thing to the Father, as the *Original* of all Things. To Him *Knowledge* ought to be *principally*, and in the *firſt place*, aſcribed: Our Saviour therefore Himſelf yields to Him the *preference*, as became Him, eſpecially here on Earth: not as if He knew leſs, but becauſe what He knew, He knew by Communication from the Father; to whom therefore He refers ſuch *ſecrets* as it was not proper

per to reveal, nor fit for Men to enquire after.

That this is all that *Irenæus* meant, may reaſonably be thought; not only becauſe otherwiſe it would be utterly inconſiſtent with many other parts of his Writings, as has been before obſerved: but alſo, becauſe ſeveral Expreſſions, in this very Paſſage, lead to it Had He really believed the divine Λόγος, or *Word*, to be *literally* Ignorant; why ſhould He be ſo apprehenſive of the difficulty of thoſe Texts? Why ſo concern'd about the fitneſs, and decency of his Interpretation; and that it might be *ſine periculo*? The danger was, in interpreting ſeemingly againſt the Text, to find a *Salvo* for the Son's Omniſcience. For this reaſon, He does not ask, why the Father only *knew* (not, *cur Pater ſolus ſcivit*) but why, or on what Account (*ſolus ſcire manifeſtatus eſt*) He was *repreſented* as alone knowing; or, He only was *ſaid* to know. He does not ſay, as the Doctor's Tranſlation inſinuates, that the Father is *more knowing* than the Son; but *præpoſitus* only; which ſignifies *ſet before*, *having the Preference*, or the like; which may be conceived, tho' He be *equally* knowing: and, for the greater Caution, it is not ſaid abſolutely, *præpoſitus eſt*; but *præpoſitus eſſe annuntiatus eſt*: He is *declared* to have the Preference: So that the Queſtion, with *Irenæus*, is not why the Father is *Superior* in knowledge; but why, ſince Father and Son

are

are equally knowing, our Saviour makes such a Declaration as gave the Preference to the Father. And the Reasons which He assigns, are very much to the purpose.

1. To instruct us, that the Father is the Fountain and Original, even of the Son Himself.

2. Because, in his then present State of Condescension, it became Him to refer all to the Father.

3. Because it may be an useful Example of Humility and Modesty to us, that we, much rather, while we are here below, may not pretend to high Things.

Upon the whole; it may appear, that *Irenæus*'s Solution of the difficulty is the very same with that which the * Doctor quotes from St. *Basil*, who had learned it from a Child: Namely this, "That our Lord meant to ascribe "to the Father, the First, (i. e. the *primary*, "*original*) Knowledge of Things Present, and "Future; and to declare to the World, that "He is in all Things the first Cause. As the Son is *God of God*, and *Light of Light*; so it is proper to say, *Omniscience of Omniscience*, &c. The Attributes being derivative, in the same Sense, as the Essence is: Which is St. *Basil*'s meaning; and, I think, *Irenæus*'s.

This Defence may be fairly and justly made for *Irenæus*, supposing that what he said, was meant of the Λόγος, or divine Nature, as such:

* *Script. Doctr.* p. 147, 148.

To

To which Opinion I incline. Nevertheleſs, I ſhould not affect to be dogmatical in That Point, ſince learned and judicious Men have been of both Sides of the Queſtion. *Petavius* * obſerves, that the Senſe is *ambiguous*; and that there are not *certain* grounds to determine us either way. If he underſtood it of the *human Nature* only; then the difficulty is nothing: if of Both, I have ſhown how fair an Account may be given of it. Having thus got over *Irenæus*, I have at once taken from you all your *Ante-Nicene* Writers. You will obſerve, that the Texts might be underſtood of the Λόγος, or *divine Nature*, as *Baſil* underſtands them, in the place above cited; and yet that They, who ſo underſtood them, might be far from thinking that the Λόγος, or *Word*, was ever ignorant of any Thing. † Dr. *Clarke*, to do him Juſtice, is, in the main, ſo very fair and reaſonable in his Account of thoſe two Texts, that we have no occaſion at all to differ with Him. I wiſh, as you have in moſt other Matters, ſo you had here alſo copied after Him.

I will not leave this Article, without giving you a Specimen of the Senſe of the *Ante-Nicene* Writers, in regard to the Son's Omniſcience; that you may have a better Opinion

* Irenæus, libro Secundo Capite 29, ambigue loquitur; ut neſcias Inſcitiam illius Diei Chriſto, ſaltem qua eſt Homo, tribuat, an non ac poſſit ad utramque deflecti ſententiam.

† *Reply to Mr.* Nelſon's *Friend*, p. 171.

of

of thoſe good and great Men. We may begin with *Ignatius*. [a] " There is nothing hid from " the Lord: But our very ſecret Things are " nigh unto Him. Let us therefore do all " Things, as having Him dwelling in us; that " we may be His Temples, and He our God " in us.

I proceed to *Clement* of *Alexandria*, who ſays thus: [b] " The Son of God never goes off " from his Watch-Tower: never parted, ne- " ver ſeparated, nor moving from Place to " Place; but is always every-where, and con- " tained no-where: all Mind, all Light, all " Eye of his Father, beholding all Things, " hearing all Things, *knowing all Things*.

[c] In another Place. " Ignorance (*in any de-* " *gree*) cannot affect God, Him that was the " Father's Counſellor before the Foundation of " the World.

[d] *Origen* is pretty large upon the very Texts whereof we have been ſpeaking. He gives ſeveral Interpretations: but it is obſervable, that He ſtudiouſly endeavors to find ſome Solu-

a Οὐδὲν λανθάνει τὸν Κύριον; ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ κρυπτὰ ἡμῶν ἐγγὺς αὐτῷ ἐστιν. Ignat. Ep. ad Epheſ. c. 15. p. 17. Ox. Ed. *That* Κύριον *is meant of Chriſt, is very highly probable from the uſe of the Word in this Author, and from the Context.*

b Οὐ γὰρ ἐξίσταταί ποτε τῆς αὐτοῦ περιωπῆς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ· οὐ μεριζόμενος, οὐκ ἀποτεμνόμενος, οὐ μεταβαίνων ἐκ τόπου εἰς τόπον, πάντῃ δὲ ὢν πάντοτε, καὶ μηδαμῇ περιεχόμενος, ὅλος νοῦς, ὅλος φῶς, Πατρῷος ὅλος Ὀφθαλμὸς, πάντα ὁρῶν, πάντα ἀκούων, εἰδὼς πάντα ——— Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 7. c. 2. p. 831. *See alſo* p. 113. 611. 832.

c Ἄγνοια γὰρ οὐχ ἅπτεται τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου συμβούλου γενομένου τοῦ Πατρός. p. 832.

d Hom. 30. in Matt.

tion,

tion, which may acquit the Λόγος from the Imputation of being literally Ignorant of the Day of Judgment. What *Origen*'s Opinion was of Christ's *Omniscience*, you may also see * elsewhere. To confirm what hath been said, one general Remark I'll leave with you.

The *Sabellian* Controversy began early, and lasted long in the Church. The Dispute was, whether Father and Son were one and the same *Hypostasis*, or *Person*. Had the Catholicks interpreted these two Texts as you pretend They did, there could not have been any Thing more decisive against the *Sabellians*. *Tertullian*, you know, encounter'd them in a pretty large Book, his Book against *Praxeas*; *Hippolytus* entered the Lists against *Noetus*; and his Book is still extant; *Eusebius*'s famed Piece, against *Marcellus*, is to the same purport; Several Fragments besides, of other Authors, remain. Please to look Them over; and see if † you can find any one of Them combating the *Sabellians* with these Texts: And if you cannot; either be content to own, that it was a very strange and unaccountable Omission in those Writers; or else that they had quite other Notions of Things, than you have hitherto

* Comm. in Joh. p. 28. Huet. Ed. *He puts the very Question, whether the Son knows all that the Father knows, and determines in the* Affirmative; *blaming those who, under pretence of magnifying the Father, presumed to deny it. The Passage is rather too long to be here inserted.*

† Tertullian *indeed cites the Text, in passing; not drawing any such Argument, as I mean, from it. What He meant will be shown hereafter, under Query 26th.*

imagined.

imagined. The *Arians* you find afterwards, perpetually almoſt, teazing the *Catholicks* with thoſe Texts: Strange they ſhould never have been inſiſted on againſt the *Sabellians*, being ſo full to the purpoſe; eſpecially if, as you ſuppoſe, the *Ante-Nicene* Writers were themſelves of that Perſwaſion, which was afterwards called *Arian*. It is evident that the *Sabellians* muſt have underſtood the Texts, if they are to be taken literally, of the *Man Chriſt Jeſus* only. Otherwiſe there had been a manifeſt repugnancy, in the Words, *not the Son, but the Father*; ſince they ſuppoſed *Father* and *Son* one and the ſame *Hypoſtaſis*. It is as plain, that they muſt have thought that the *Catholicks* agreed with them in that Expoſition; otherwiſe they would have charged them, not only with *Tritheiſm*, but with the denial of the Son's *eſſential Divinity*. It does not appear that thoſe Texts ever came into Controverſy betwixt Them; or were ever urged by the *Catholicks*; ſo that Both ſeem to have agreed in the ſame Interpretation. So much for the Point of *Omniſcience*.

I come next to conſider what you have to object to my Argument for the Son's *Eternity*. I had put it upon this; that it is deſcribed in the ſame Phraſes, with God the Father's; which, one would think, ſhould be high enough. You tell me that *the Son's* Metaphyſical *Eternity is no where expreſly revealed* What the fine word, *Metaphyſical*, ſignifies here, I know not.

If

If his *Eternity* is revealed, it is enough for me. That I understand to be revealed, in these two Texts, Rev. 1. 17.——22. 13. *I am the first, and I am the last. I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End.* That these, and the like Phrases respect *Duration*, appears from *Isa.* 43. 10. compared with *Isa.* 44. 6. In the latter, the Words are; *I am the first, and I am the last, and besides me there is no God.* The former, expressing the same Thought, runs thus: *Before me was there no God formed, neither shall there be after me.* The Phrase of A and Ω, First and Last, is, in like manner, explained *Rev.* 1. 8. *I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the Ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come.* The Phrase then respects *Duration*; and it is applied to our blessed Saviour, as hath been shown; *Rev.* 1. 17.---22. 13. Therefore there was no God before Him: Therefore He is, in the strictest Sense, *Eternal.* You say, *the Objector hath not brought one Text of Scripture that at all proveth it.* I did not produce all the Texts proper upon that Head: I design'd Brevity. Besides, I had a mind to remove the Cause, from Criticism upon Words, to one plain and affecting Argument: *viz.* That the Proof the *Son's* Eternity stands upon the same Foot, in Scripture, with the Proof of the *Father's*; and is express'd in as strong Words. And for this, I appeal, as to the Texts above cited, so also to *Prov.* 8. 22, &c. which you

allow to be ſpoken of the *Meſſias*. The original Word, which we tranſlate, *from Everlaſting*, is the very ſame with what we meet with in *Pſal.* 90. 2. where alſo we find a parallel Deſcription of *Eternity*, applied to the *one God*. See alſo *Pſal.* 93. 2. I allow your Obſervation, that the *Hebrew* word may, and ſometimes does, ſignify a *limited*, as well as it does, at other times, an *unlimited* Duration. And therefore I do not lay all the ſtreſs of my Argument upon the critical meaning of the Word; but upon That, and other Circumſtances taken together: particularly this Circumſtance; that the *Eternity* of the *Father* is deſcribed in the ſame Manner, and in the ſame Phraſes, with the other; as by * Comparing *Pſal.* 90. 2. with *Prov.* 8. 22, *&c.* and *Rev.* 1. 8, with *Rev.* 22. 13. may fully appear. I do not argue from a ſingle Phraſe, or the particular force of it; but from *ſeveral*; and theſe *equally* applied to Both: as it were on purpoſe to intimate, that though theſe Phraſes *ſingly* might bear a limited Senſe; yet conſidering that God had made choice of them as moſt ſignificant to expreſs his *own Duration*; and again made choice of the very ſame, out of many

* *Before the Mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadſt formed the Earth and the World: even from everlaſting, Thou art God*, Pſal. 90. 2.

The Lord poſſeſs'd me in the beginning of his way, before his Works of old. I was ſet up from everlaſting, from the beginning, or ever the Earth was——Before the Mountains were ſettled; before the Hills, was I brought forth, Prov. 8. 22, &c.

others,

others, to expreſs his *Son*'s *Duration* too, we might from thence be taught to believe that the Son is *Co-eternal* with Him.

You are ſenſible of the Objection lying againſt you; namely, that there's no certain Proof, according to your way of reaſoning, of the *Eternity* of the Father, in the Old Teſtament: And ſo reſolute you are in this Matter, that, rather than admit the *Son* to be *eternal* too, you are content to leave us in the Dark, ſo far as the *Old Teſtament* goes, about the other. But, for a *Salvo* to the Father's *Eternity*, you obſerve, that it is *emphatically* expreſs'd in the *New Teſtament* (Rom. 1. 20.) forgetting that the word Ἀΐδιος occurs but *once more, in the New Teſtament; and then ſignifies *eternal* in a *limited* Senſe only, or a *parte poſt*, as the Schools ſpeak. Well then, for any thing I ſee to the contrary, we muſt contentedly go away, without any Scripture Proof of the Eternity of the *Father*; for fear it ſhould oblige us to take in the *Son*'s alſo. And this, indeed, is what you are before-hand apprehenſive of, and prepared for; and therefore it is that you tell us, that *there appears no neceſſity at all, that the Attribute of* Eternity *ſhould be diſtinctly revealed with reſpect to the* Father; *whoſe Eternity our reaſon infallibly aſſures us of*, (p. 50.) Infallibly aſſures: So you ſay; and, I believe, *in my own way*, I might be able to maintain your Aſſertion. But I profeſs to you,

* Jude v. 6.

that I do not, at preſent, apprehend, how, *upon your Principles*, you will be able to make any compleat Demonſtration of it. It would be ridiculous to talk of proving from *Reaſon* only, without Revelation, that the Perſon whom we call the *Father*, the God of *Jews* and *Chriſtians*, is the *Eternal* God. I will therefore preſume that you mean, by *Reaſon*, Reaſon and Revelation Both together; and if you effectually prove your Point from Both, it ſhall ſuffice. You can demonſtrate that there muſt be ſome *eternal God*, in the *metaphyſical* Senſe, as you call it, of theſe Words: But ſince the *Father*, the God of *Jews* and *Chriſtians*, has not declared, either that He is *Eternal*, or *God*, in the *metaphyſical* Senſe; it does not appear how He is at all concern'd in it. He has ſaid, indeed, that there is *no God beſides Him*; but as He did not mean it in the *metaphyſical* Senſe, there may be Another, in that Senſe, *beſides Him*, notwithſtanding: Nay, it is certain there are and have been other Gods; even in the *ſame* Senſe: For *Moſes* was a *God* unto *Pharaoh*; and Chriſt is *God*; and therefore this cannot be *literally* true. It can only mean, that He is *emphatically* God, in ſome reſpect or other; perhaps as being God, of our Syſtem; or God of the *Jews* and *Chriſtians*, his *peculium*. It is true, He has called Himſelf *Jehovah*; which if it ſignified neceſſary exiſtence and independence, it would be an irrefragable Proof of his being the *eternal* God. But it unfor-

unfortunately happens that *Jehovah* ſignifies no more than a Perſon of Honour and Integrity, who is true to his Word, and *performs* his *Promiſes* (*p.* 19.) He has farther declared Himſelf to be *Creator* of the World: But this *exerciſe* of creating, being *finite*, *does not neceſſarily infer an infinite Subject*, (p. 48.) Beſides *that this Office and Character, relative to us, pre-ſuppoſes not, nor is at all more perfect for, the eternal paſt Duration of his Being*, (See p. 50.) What ſhall I think of next? I muſt ingenuouſly own, I am utterly non-pluſs'd; and therefore muſt deſire you, whenever you favor me with a reply, to make out your Demonſtration. But let us proceed.

Having given us a Reaſon, why it was not neceſſary that the *ſuppoſed Eternity* of the Father ſhould be revealed, you go on to acquaint us, why it was not needful to declare the *ſuppoſed Eternity* of the Son. And here you give either two Reaſons, or one; I hardly know whether. *His Office and Character*, you ſay, *relative to us, does not pre-ſuppoſe it.* I know that very wiſe and judicious Men have thought, that it does *pre-ſuppoſe* it. Biſhop *Bull*, for inſtance, has ſpoke admirably well upon that Head. But the Paſſage being too long to tranſcribe, I ſhall only refer to it *. How you come to take for granted a Thing which you know nothing of, and which it is impoſſible either for

* Judic. Eccl. *p.* 12.

You, or any Man elſe to prove. I know not. It is very manifeſt that, unleſs you have a full Idea of the whole Work of Redemption, and can tell as well what belongs to a Redeemer, and a Judge of the whole Univerſe, as you can what belongs to a Rector of a Pariſh, you can paſs no certain Judgement. No Man can certainly define the utmoſt of what was needful in the Caſe; becauſe no Man can dive into the utmoſt depth of it. There may be more then You, or I, or perhaps Angels, can ſee, in that myſterious Diſpenſation; and therefore it is the height of Preſumption to pronounce, that any Power, leſs than Infinite, might be equal to it. I do not ſay that the Argument for Chriſt's *Divinity* drawn from the greatneſs of the Work of Redemption, and the Honours conſequent upon it, amounts to a perfect Demonſtration: But this I ſay, and am very clear in what I ſay, that it is much ſurer arguing for the *Affirmative*, from what we know; than for the *Negative*, from what we know not. It is poſſible our Proof may not be ſufficient: But it is, *a priori*, impoſſible that your's ſhould. Whether we can maintain our Point, may perhaps be a Queſtion: but it is out of all Queſtion, that you cannot maintain your's.

Having anſwer'd this your firſt Reaſon, why it was not neceſſary to reveal the Son's Eternity, I proceed to the remaining Words; which if I perfectly underſtood, I might know whether they are a diſtinct Reaſon, or only an Appendage

pendage to the former. They are theſe: *Nor is it* (Chriſt's Office and Character) *at all more perfect for the eternal paſt Duration of his Being*, (p. 50.) I have been conſidering why that word, *Paſt*, was inſerted, and what it can mean, in that place. It ſeems to be oppoſed either to *preſent*, or elſe to, *to come*, tacitely underſtood. At firſt, I thought thus: That it might be put in to prevent our Imagining that Chriſt's Office might not be at all more perfect for the eternal Duration of his Being, *to come*. But conſidering again, that if He does but continue till the *Office* is compleated and perfected, it is all one, in reſpect of that *Office*, whether his Duration hold longer or no; I thought, That could not be the meaning. Reflecting again, I conceived that, *Paſt*, might poſſibly have relation to the Office conſider'd as *preſent*, or commencing at ſuch a Time; ſuppoſe Six Thouſand Years ago: And you might think; what could it ſignify to date his Being Higher? If He did but exiſt, ſoon enough for the Office, it is ſufficient. All the Time run out before, is of no Conſideration; having no Relation to an *Office* which was to commence after, and would ſtill be but the Self-ſame *Temporal* Office, commencing at ſuch a Time. If I have hit your Thought at length, I aſſure you, it has coſt Me ſome Pains; and I wiſh you would expreſs your ſelf more clearly hereafter.

Now then, let us apply this Manner of Reaſoning to another Purpoſe: By parity of Reaſon

we may argue, that the Office of God the Father, *commencing* at the Creation; I say, the Office of Sustaining, Preserving, and Governing the World, has no Relation to the Time *past*, being but just what it is, whether a longer or a shorter, or no Time at all be allowed for any *prior* Existence; nor is it at all more perfect for the eternal past Duration of his Being. But does not this Argument suppose that the Office is such as may be discharged by a finite Creature, or one that began in Time? Certainly. And is not that the very Thing in Question in this, and in the other Case too? Undoubtedly. How then comes it to be taken for granted? Besides; is not a Person of unlimited, that is, eternal Powers and Perfections, more capable of discharging an Office, than any *Creature*? Well then, by necessary Consequence, the *past* Duration of the Person is of great Moment in the Case; and the Office must be thought as much more perfect, for the *eternal past Duration of his Being*, as God's Perfections excel those of his Creatures; and that is infinitely.

QUERY VIII.

Whether Eternity *does not imply* neceſſary Exiſtence *of the Son*; *which is inconſiſtent with the Doctor's Scheme? And whether the* **Doctor hath not made an* eluſive, Equivocating *Anſwer to the Objection*, *ſince the Son may be a* neceſſary Emanation *from the* Father, *by the* Will *and Power of the Father*, *without any Contradiction?* Will *is one Thing*, *and* Arbitrary *Will another.*

TO the former part of the Query you anſwer, that *ſimple and abſolute Eternity is the ſame with* Neceſſary, or Self-exiſtence; *which is no where ſuppos'd of the Son*, *by Dr.* Clarke. Here are ſeveral Miſtakes: For, firſt, the *Idea* of *ſimple* Eternity is not the ſame with that of *Neceſſary-exiſtence*. Nor, ſecondly, is it the ſame with both *Neceſſary-exiſtence* and *Self-exiſtence*, ſuppoſing it were the ſame with the former; becauſe theſe two are not the ſame. The *Idea* of *Eternity* is neither more nor leſs than *Duration* without *beginning*, and without *end*. Some have ſuppoſed it poſſible for God to have *created* the World from all Eternity; and they uſe this Argument for it; that whatever He could *once* do, He could *always* do. Not that I think there is much weight in

* *Reply*, p. 227.

the

the Argument; but it is sufficient to shew, that the *Ideas* are distinct; and that, tho' *Eternity* may, in sound Reasoning, infer or imply *Necessary-existence*, as is intimated in the Query; yet the *Ideas* are not the same: For if they were; it would be Nonsense to talk of *one* inferring or implying the *other*. Then for the second Point; it is very manifest that the *Ideas* of *Necessary-existence*, and *Self-existence* (however they may be imagined *with*, or *without* Reason, to imply each other) are not the same *Ideas*. * *Aristotle*, and the later *Platonists* supposed the World and all the inferior Gods (as *Plato* and the *Pythagoreans*, some *Supramundane* Deities) to proceed, by way of Emanation, without any Temporary Production, from a Superior Cause: That is, they believed them to be *Necessary*, but not *Self-existent*. Something like this has been constantly believed by the Christian Church, in respect of the Λόγος: Which shows, at least, that the *Ideas* are different; and not only so, but that, in the Opinion of a great part of Mankind, they do not so much as infer and imply each other; one may be conceived without the other. However, that is not the Point I insist on now. All that I affirm, at present, is, that the *Ideas* are distinct; and not the very same. After you had laboured to confound these Things together, you proceed to argue against

* *See* Cudworth. Intellect. System. *p.* 250, *&c.*

the

the Son's being *eternal*. But what is that to the Query? I supposed Dr. *Clarke* (*Reply*, p. 227.) to understand the word *Eternal*, as I, or any other Man should; and objected the inconsistency of acknowledging the *Eternity* of the Son, and yet denying his *Necessary existence*; which, *Eternity*, I thought, infer'd and implied. You admit my reasoning to be just, if the Doctor meant the same, by *Eternal*, as I do. But if He meant by *Eternal*, *Temporary*, then my Argument fails; as most certainly it must. But why are we thus imposed on with so manifest an abuse of Words? What occasion is there for putting the Epithets of *simple*, *absolute*, or *metaphysical* to the word *Eternal*; which every one, that knows *English*, understands better without? Unless you suppose that there is an *unlimited*, and a *limited* Eternity; which is, in reality, an Eternity, and no Eternity. You proceed to dispute against the *Eternity* of the Son; which tho' it be something foreign to the purport of the Query, yet being pertinent to the Cause in hand, I shall here consider it. You argue that, if the Son be *Eternal*, He is *Necessarily-existing*; which I allow: and if *Necessarily-existing*, then *Self-existent*; which I * deny: and you cannot prove.

* Ἀλλὰ μή τις, τὸ ἀεὶ, ὡσεὶ ὑπόνοιαν ἀγεννήτε λαμβανέτω, ὡς οὖν οἱ τὰ ψυχῆς αἰσθητήρια πεπηρωμένοι· οὔτε γὰρ τὸ ἦν, οὔτε τὸ ἀεὶ, οὔτε τὸ περὶ αἰώνων, ταυτόν ἐστι τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ. Alex. Ep. apud. Theod. l. 1. c. 4. p. 17. *This was said in Opposition to the* Arians, *who were willing to confound the Idea of Eternity and of Necessary-existence, with* Self-existence. *The Learned Doctor cites this Passage, directly against*

You

You go on to a new Conſideration; which, put into Syllogiſm, ſtands thus.

Whatever has a *principium* is not Eternal: The Son has a *principium*, the Father being *principium Filii* — Therefore, *&c.*

The middle Term, *principium*, is *equivocal*, and bears two Senſes; wherefore the Syllogiſm conſiſts of four *Terms*. If *principium* be underſtood in reſpect of *Time*, the *Minor* is not true: if it be taken in any other Senſe, the *Major* is not true: So that Both cannot be true. You might, in the ſame way, argue that the Sun's Light is not coeval with the Sun; nor Thought coeval with the *Mind*, ſuppoſing the Mind to think always. For, in both Caſes, a *principium* is admitted; but no Priority, in reſpect of *Time*. You add, that there is a *reaſonable* Senſe in which the Son may be ſaid to be *Eternal*. I hope there is: But not *your* Senſe; which is juſt as *reaſonable*, as to ſay; an *Angel* is *eternal*, only becauſe you determine not the Time when He came into Being. I ſhould think it moſt *reaſonable*, to uſe Words, according to their obvious, and proper Signification; and not to fix new *Ideas* to old Words, without any warrant for it. In this way of going on with the abuſe of Words, we ſhall hardly have any left, full and expreſs enough

Himſelf (Script. Doctr. p. 283.) *It was intended, and is diametrically oppoſite to the Doctor's leading Principle, or rather Fallacy, which runs thro' his Performance,* viz. *That the Son cannot be ſtrictly and eſſentially God, unleſs He be* Self-exiſtent, *or* unoriginate *in every Senſe.*

to

to distinguish the *Catholick* Doctrine by. It was once sufficient, before the rise of *Arianism*, to say, the Son is *God:* But by a novel Sense put upon it, the word (*God*) was made Ambiguous. To That were added *truly*, and *really*; to be more expressive: But the * *Arians* found out a sense for these Terms too; and could gravely say, that the Son was *truly*, *really* God. God *by Nature*, one might think, is full and strong enough: But you are stealing away the Sense of that Expression from us. We can add no more, but *eternally* and *substantially* God; and yet, I perceive, unless we put in *simply*, *absolutely*, *metaphysically*, or the like, even these Words also may lose their Force and Significancy. But to what purpose is all this? Might you not better say plainly, that the Son is not *Eternal*; not by *Nature*; nor *truly* God; in a word, not *God?* No, but Scripture reclaims; and the whole *Catholick* Church reclaims; and Christian Ears would not bear it. So then, it seems, it is highly necessary to *speak* Orthodoxly, whatever we *think*; to strip the words of their Sense, and to retain the Sound. But to proceed.

As to the latter part of the Query, I am to expect no clear or distinct Answer: Because *what is meant by a necessary Emanation by the Will of the Father, you understand not; nor what again by the difference of* Will, *and* Arbitrary *Will*, p. 52. Had you but retain'd

* *See* Socr. E. Hist. l. 2. c. 19. p. 82. Theod. l. 1. c. 28.

in

in Mind, what you muſt have obſerved, when you read the *Antients*, you could not have been at a loſs to apprehend my meaning. You may pleaſe to remember, that one of the principal Arguments made uſe of by the [a] *Arians*, againſt the *Catholicks*, was this:

[b] Either the Father begat the Son with his Conſent and Will; or againſt his Will and Conſent: If the *former*, then that *Act* of the Will was *Antecedent* to the Son's Exiſtence; and therefore He was not Eternal: The *latter*, was plainly too abſurd for any Chriſtian to own.

The *Catholicks* took two ways of anſwering the *Dilemma*. One, which was the beſt and ſafeſt, was, by [c] retorting upon the *Arians*, the *Dilemma*, thus: Was God the Father, *God, with*, or *againſt* his Will? By this ſhort Queſtion, That ſo famous Objection of the *Arians*, was [d] effectually ſilenc'd.

a *See* Athanaſ. Orat. Contr. Arian. 2, 3, 4. Hilary, p. 1184. Greg. Nyſſ. p. 625. Petav. de Trin. p. 128.

b Interrogant (Ariani) utrum Pater Filium *Volens* an *Nolens* genuerit; ut ſi reſponſum fuerit quod *Volens* genuerit, dicant, *prior* eſt ergo *Voluntas* Patris; quod autem *Nolens* genuerit, quis poteſt dicere? *Auguſt. Contr. Serm. Arian. l.* 1. *p.* 626. Bened. Ed.

c Athanaſ. Orat. 3. p. 611. Bened Ed. Greg. Nazianz. Orat. 35. p. 565. Auguſt. de Trin. l. 15. c. 80. p. 994.

d Viciſſim quæſivit ab eo, utrum Deus Pater, *Volens* an *Nolens*, ſit Deus: ut ſi reſponderet, *Nolens*, ſequeretur illa miſeria quam de Deo credere magna inſania eſt; ſi autem diceret, *Volens*, reſponderetur ei, ergo & *Ipſe* Deus eſt, ſua *Voluntate*, non *Natura*. Quid ergo reſtabat, niſi ut obmuteſceret, & ſua interrogatione obligatum inſolubili vinculo ſe videret. *Auguſt. ibid.*

But

But beſides this Anſwer, they had alſo another. They admitted that the Generation of the Son was *with the Will and Conſent* of his Father; in the ſame Senſe that He is wiſe, good, juſt, *&c. neceſſarily*, and yet not againſt his Will. Some thought it reaſonable to ſay, that the Father might *eternally* will the Generation of the Son, and that He could not but *will* ſo, as being *eternally Good.* [a] See *Petavius*. This way of reaſoning [b] Biſhop *Bull* mentions, hardly approving it: And one would almoſt think that [c] Dr. *Clarke* was once inclinable to ſubſcribe to it, underſtanding *eternal*, as we do. But He thought fit [d] afterwards to explain Himſelf off, into another meaning. There was another Notion which [e] ſome of the primitive Writers had; Namely, this: That ſince the *Will* of God is God Himſelf, as much as the *Wiſdom*, &c. of God, is God Himſelf; whatever is the fruit and product of God, is *the fruit* and *product of his Will*, Wiſdom, *&c.* and ſo, the Son, being the perfect Image of the Father, is *Subſtance of Subſtance*, *Wiſdom of Wiſdom*, *Will of Will*, as He is *Light of Light*, and *God of God:* which is St. *Auſtin*'s Doctrine, in the [f] place cited in the Margin.

a Pag. 591, 592. b D. F. N. p. 222.

c Script. Doctr. p. 280. *&c. Reply*, p. 113. *Paper given in to the Biſhops.* d *Clarke*'s Lett. N. 8.

e *See the Teſtimonies collected by* Cotelerius, *in his Notes upon the* Recognitions *of Clem.* p. 492. *and by* Petavius, l. 6. c. 8. l. 7. c. 12. *See eſpecially*, Athanaſ. Orat. 3. p. 613. Bened. Ed. Epiphan. Hæreſ. 74. p. 895. f De Trin. l. 15. c. 8.

By

By this time, I presume, you may understand what I meant by the latter part of the Query. There is a sober, *Catholick* Sense, in which the Son may be acknowledged to be *by*, or *from*, the *Will* of the Father; and yet may be a *necessary Emanation* also. And therefore Dr. *Clarke* did not do well in opposing those two, one to the other; as if they were inconsistent: Especially considering that He produces several Authorities to prove the Generation to be by a * *Power of Will*, in opposition to *Necessity of Nature*, from *Writers* who asserted *Both*; and denied only such a supposed *necessity* as might be against, and a force upon the Father's Will. This is manifest of his Citations from the † *Council of Sirmium*, *Marius Victorinus*, *Basil*, and *Gregory Nyssen*; and hath been clearly shown by his Learned ‡ Antagonist. The Sum of all is, that the Generation of the Son may be, by *Necessity of Nature*, without excluding the Concurrence or Approbation of the Will. And therefore *Will*, (*i.e.* consent, approbation, acquiescence) is *one Thing*; and *Arbitrary Will*, (that is, free Choice of what might otherwise not be) is *Another*. You endeavor to prove, that the Son derives his Being from the *Will* of the Father, in this latter Sense; which is the same thing with the making Him a *Creature*. You recite some

* Script. Doctr. p. 281, *&c.*
† Script. Doctr. p. 185, 186.
‡ True Script. Doctr. continued, p. 119, *&c.*

Scraps

Scraps of Quotations, as collected by Dr. *Clarke* and Dr. *Whitby*, in your Notes (*p.* 51.) Not one of the Citations is to your Purpose, or comes up to your Point. For instance; *Ignatius* says, * Christ is the *Son of God, according to the Will and Power of God.* Supposing this not to be meant of his † miraculous Conception, and Incarnation, (which the Context has been thought to favour, and which Bishop *Pearson* inclined to, in his Notes) yet see how many several Interpretations it may bear, besides what you would fix upon it.

1. *The Fruit and Off-spring of the Will and Power of God:* signifying no more than *God of God*, in the Sense intimated above. *p.* 127.

2. By the *eternal* Will and Power of God, in a Sense likewise before intimated, and own'd by some of the *Post-Nicene* Writers.

* Ἀληθῶς ὄντα ἐκ γένους Δαβὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, υἱὸν Θεοῦ κατὰ θέλημα καὶ δύναμιν Θεοῦ.— Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. c. 1. p. 1.

† *I can by no means think, that the Son is here called,* υἱὸς Θεοῦ, *in respect of his Incarnation; which was really his Nativity* κατὰ σάρκα, *to which this other is opposed, and which must therefore be understood of some higher* Sonship. *The Phrase of* κατὰ σάρκα, *has been constantly so interpreted by the Antients;* Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Novatian, *the* Synod *of* Antioch *in the Case of* Paul *of* Samosata, Hippolytus, Eusebius, Lactantius, *all explaining Christ's being the Son of* David according to the Flesh, *by his Birth of the blessed Virgin; and the Phrase* κατὰ σάρκα *as opposed to a prior* Sonship, *in his* divine *Nature before the World was; in which respect He was* Son of God, *before He became* Son of Man. *That* Ignatius *intended the same is highly probable, not to say evident, from his own Words, else where.* Ποῦ αἰώνων παρὰ πατρὶ ἦν. Magnes. c. 6. Υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃς ἐστιν αὐτοῦ λόγῳ ἀϊδίῳ. Ibid. c. 8. Χριστῷ τῷ ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, τῷ γενομένῳ, ἐν ὑστέρῳ ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ. Rom. c. 7.

3. With the Approbation, and Acquiescence of God, in the same Sense that He is pleased with, and acquiesces in, his own Wisdom, Goodness, and other Perfections.

4. The passage may relate, not to the Son's *Generation* in the highest Sense; but to his *Manifestation*, or *Coming forth*, in order to create the World; which is a kind of * *Filiation* mention'd by *Justin Martyr*, *Athenagoras*, *Theophilus*, *Tertullian*, *Tatian*, *Novatian*, and *Hippolytus*, and supposed as *voluntary* a Thing, as the Incarnation afterwards; tho' the same Authors asserted the *Eternity* and *Consubstantiality* of the λόγος, or divine Nature of Christ; of which more hereafter.

From these four Particulars you may perceive, how little you can be able to prove from that Passage in *Ignatius*. As to *Justin Martyr*, I have already hinted, in what Sense He made the Generation *voluntary*. But why you should chuse to do that good Father a double Injury, first in curtailing his Words, and next in misrepresenting his Sense, you can best Account. The whole Passage is this, literally translated: "† Who, according to his (*the Father's*) good

* Clement *of* Alexandria *seems to intend the same* (p. 654. Ed. Ox.) *expressing it by the word* προελθὼν. *And it is extremely probable that* Ignatius *had the very same Thought.* Λόγος ἀϊδιος οὐκ ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθὼν. ad Magnes. cap. 8. Ἕνα Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν ἀφ' ἑνὸς πατρὸς προελθόντα, καὶ εἰς ἕνα ὄντα καὶ χωρήσαντα. Ibid. cap. 7.

† Τὸν κατὰ βουλὴν τὴν ἰδικὴν καὶ Θεὸν ὄντα, Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ Ἄγγελον, ὃς ὑπηρετεῖν τῇ γνώμῃ αὐτοῦ. p. 280. Sylb. Jeb. 370. *Parallel to*

"Plea-

" Pleasure, is God, being his Son; and an " Angel too, as ministring to his Father's Will. The meaning is not, as you represent it, that Christ is *God, by the Will of the Father* (tho' even that might bear a good Sense according to what has been observed above) but that it was the Father's good pleasure that He should not only be *God*, as He always was, being God's Son; but that He should take upon Him besides, the *Office* of an *Angel*. That He was *God* was a * *necessary* Thing, as He was *God's Son*, of the same nature with Him: but that He should be *Both*; *i. e.* God and an Angel too; this was entirely owing to God's good Pleasure. However, you have been something civiller to this antient Father, than Dr. *Whitby* has been, in his *modest Disquisitions*; who, to serve a bad Cause, uses a worse Art; † cuts the Quotation short at ὑὸν αὐτῦ; and then, to make his own Sense out of that Passage, inserts (*Et*) in his Translation, rendring it thus: *Qui ex voluntate Ipsius & Deus est*, Et *Filius*; leaving out, *Et Angelus*, to which the former, *Et*, re-

which is that of Novatian. Personæ autem Christi convenit ut & Deus sit, quia Dei Filius; & Angelus sit, quoniam paternæ dispositionis Adnunciator est. *Novat.* c. 26.

* *For, tho' He was God, as being God's Son; and a Son* κατὰ βελὴν, *according to* Justin, *and other Writers before mention'd; yet they did not think that He was* God, κατὰ βελὴν. *But because He* came forth, *as a Son, from the Father; and was not produc'd* ἐξ ὄντων, *(as all* Creatures *are) therefore He was* God, *having ever existed, before his* Coming forth, *in and with the Father.* Hic ergo quando pater voluit, processit ex Patre: & Qui in Patre fuit, processit ex Patre. *Novat.* c. 26.

† *Whitby's* Disqu. Modest. p. 32.

ferr'd. Strange that any ſhould be ſo reſolutely eager to *ungod* their Saviour, as not to permit the cauſe to have a fair hearing. It were pious, at leaſt, to let the Reader know, what has, or what can be ſaid on the other ſide of the Queſtion; and to give it its due Weight and Force. This is reaſonable in any the moſt trifling Matter, that can come before us: But certainly much more ſo, where *His* Honour is concern'd, whom All Men are commanded to *Honour*, even as They *Honour the Father*, Joh. 5. 23. For my own part, I declare once for all; I deſire only to have Things fairly repreſented, as they really are; no Evidence ſmother'd, or ſtifled, on either Side. Let every Reader ſee plainly what may be *juſtly* pleaded here, or there, and no more; and then let it be left to his impartial Judgement, after a full view of the Caſe: Miſquotation and Miſrepreſentation will do a *good* Cauſe harm; and will not long be of Service to a *bad* one. But to return: The ſecond Citation which you bring from *Juſtin*, you give ſuch an Account of, as muſt make one think, either that you never ſaw the Book you mention; or elſe —— but ſee the Paſſage in the * Margin. Your words are; *He hath all theſe Titles* (*before mention'd*, viz.

* Ἔχειν γὰρ πάντα προσονομάζεσθαι, ἔκ τε τοῦ ὑπηρετεῖν τῷ πατρικῷ βουλήματι, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς θελήσει γεγεννῆσθαι. Dial. p. 183. Jeb. *It is not from his being Begotten of the Father, that He hath* all *theſe Titles; but from that, and his Adminiſtring to his Father's Will. Both together, (not either* ſingly) *will account for all theſe Titles.*

that

that of Son, Wisdom, Angel, God, Lord, and Word) *from his being Begotten of the Father by his Will*; directly contrary to the whole Tenor of the *Dialogue*; and the very immediate Words preceding those you cite. In your third Quotation, you are pleas'd, for the sake of *English* Readers, to mistranslate προελθόντα, *produced*, in stead of, *coming forth*, or *proceeding*. Your next Citation is from *Clement* of *Alexandria*: In which I find no fault but your referring to *Strom.* 5. instead of *Strom.* 7. and bringing a Passage not certainly pertinent to the Point in Question. If you please to look into the *Author Himself, you will find it, at least, doubtful, whether He be speaking of the *Generation* of the Son; or only showing how He, by the Father's good Pleasure, was at the Head of Affairs, and administred his Father's Kingdom. Your next Author is † *Tertullian*, who is indeed speaking of the Generation, that is, *Manifestation*, or *Coming forth*, of the Son: And here you render *protulit*, *produced*, meaning *into Being*, or into a *State of Existence*; which is not *Tertullian*'s Sense, nor of any of the Fathers, who speak of that Matter. *Tertullian* expressly ‡ excepts against it: So does

* Clem. Alex. Strom. 7. p. 833. Ox. Edit. Ἁπάντων τῶν ἀγαθῶν, θελήματι τοῦ παντοκράτορος πατρὸς, αἰτίῳ ὁ υἱὸς καθίσταται, πρωτεργὸς κινήσεως, δύναμις ἄληπτος αἰσθήσει· ὁ γὰρ ὢν, τοῦτο ὤφθη τοῖς χωρῆσαι μὴ δυναμένοις διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκός. αἰσθητὴν δὲ ἀναλαβὼν σάρκα, &c.

† Tunc cum Deus voluit, ipsum primum *protulit* Sermonem. *Tertul. Contr. Prax.* c. 6.

‡ Contr. Prax. c. 5.

[a] *Tatian*, the next Author which you name: And ſo likewiſe [b] *Athenagoras*, and [c] *Hippolytus*, whom you have not named: But I chuſe to mention Them, as being uſeful to explain the former. [d] *Euſebius* may reaſonably be interpreted by Thoſe that went before Him; or by the Emperor *Conſtantine*'s Explication of this matter, which ſhall be cited hereafter; or by his own Account of the Holy undivided Trinity, before mention'd: If not; his Authority, againſt the Catholicks before and after Him, and againſt Himſelf, muſt appear of ſmall Weight. The reſt of your *Authorities* I have already ſpoke to; and you may perceive, by this Time, I preſume, that none of them ſpeak home to the purpoſe for which they were cited. However, for the ſake of ſuch who, being little acquainted with theſe Matters, may be liable to be impoſed upon by a few ſpecious Pretences, I ſhall now go a little deeper into the Point before us; and endeavor to ſet it in a true Light.

The Diſtinction of a [e] *threefold Generation* of the Son, is well known among the Learned, and is thus explain'd.

1. The firſt, and moſt proper *Filiation*, and *Generation* is his eternally exiſting in, and of

a Tatian. Sect. 7. p. 20. Ox. Edit.
b Legat. Sect. 10. p. 39. Ox. Edit.
c Contr. Noet. Sect. 10. p. 13. Vol. 2. Ed. Fabric.
d *See True Script. Doctr. continued*, p. 123.
e Bull. D. F. p. 232. Brev. Animadv. in Gil. Clerke p. 1054. Fabric. Not' in Hippol. Vol. 1. p. 242.

the

the Father; The eternal Λόγος, of the eternal Mind. In respect of this, chiefly, He is the *only begotten*, and a distinct Person from the Father. His other Generations were rather Condescensions, first to Creatures in general, next to Men in particular.

2. His *second* Generation was his *Condescension, Manifestation, coming forth*, as it were, from the Father (tho' never separated or divided from Him) to create the World: This was in Time, and a voluntary Thing; and in this respect properly, He may be thought to be πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως: *Firstborn of every Creature*; or before all Creatures.

3. His *third* Generation, or Filiation, was when He condescended to be born of a Virgin, and to become Man. These Things I here suppose or premise only, for the more distinct Apprehension of what is to follow; not expecting to be believed farther than the Proofs can justify. We may now proceed to speak of the Doctrine of the *Antients*.

It is observable, that the *Ante-Nicene* Writers are more sparing, than Those that came after, in speaking of the *first*, the *eternal Generation: Sparing*, I mean, as to the *Term*, or *Phrase*; not as to the *Thing* it self. The Eternity of the Word, or Λόγος, and the Distinction of Persons, they all held; together with the Consubstantiality, and Unity of Principle; which together are as much as can be meant by *eternal Generation*.

Irenæus is a [a] frequent and constant Asserter of the *Eternity* of the *Word*; but *eternal Generation* we do not read in expres's Terms. Yet we find what amounts to it, by necessary Implication. In one particular place, [b] He censures those who pretended to ascribe *any beginning* to the Nativity of the Word; which is, in effect, asserting an eternal *Prolation*, or *Generation*; for He makes these words [c] equivalent.

Origen, Commenting upon the Words of the second Psalm: *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee*; Proceeds thus: "[d] They are "spoken to Him by God, with whom it is "*always* To day: For, I conceive, there is no "Evening nor Morning with Him; but the "Time co-extended, if I may so speak, with "his unbegotten and eternal Life is the *To* "*Day* in which the Son is begotten; there "being *no beginning* found of his Generation, "any more than of the *To Day*. This is far-

a Pag. 153. 163. 209. 253. Ed. Bened. *We do not pretend to argue merely from the force of the word* semper, *or* ἀεὶ, *but from That and other Circumstances: as when* Infectus *goes along with it, or the like*, p. 153. *And as* Semper aderat generi humano, p. 209. *intimates that He was with Men, as soon as any Men existed; So,* existens semper apud Patrem, *intimates his being* coeval *with the Father.*

b Prolationis initium donantes, *l.* 2. *c.* 14. *p.* 132.

c *l.* 2. *c.* 28. *p.* 158.

d Λέγεται πρὸς αὐτὸν ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, ᾧ ἀεί ἐστι τὸ σήμερον, οὐκ ἔνι γὰρ ἑσπέρα Θεῷ. ἐγὼ δὲ ἡγοῦμαι ὅτι οὐδὲ πρωΐα· Ἀλλ' ὁ συμπαρεκτεινων τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ τὸ ἀΐδιον αὐτοῦ ζωῇ, ἵν' ὅπως εἰπω, χρόνος, ἡμέρα ἐστὶν αὐτῷ σήμερον, ἐν ᾗ γεγέννηται ὁ υἱός. ἀρχῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ ὅπως οὐχ εὑρισκομένης, ὡς οὐδὲ τῆς ἡμέρας. Com. in Joh. p. 31. *Compare with this, the Citations from* Origen, *in* Pamphilus's *Apology.*

ther

ther confirm'd by what [a] *Athanaſius* quotes from Him, where *Origen* calls it Preſumption [b] *to aſcribe any Beginning to the Son*; and ſpeaks of the *only begotten*, as being [c] *always* with the Father.

To *Origen* I may ſubjoin [d] *Novatian*, who ſays the Son muſt have *always* exiſted in the Father, or elſe (which He takes to be abſurd) the *Father* would not have been *always Father*. This, I think, can bear no Senſe, unleſs *always* be underſtood ſtrictly. And it is very manifeſt that [e] *Novatian* ſuppoſes the Son to have exiſted before that *Proceſſion*, *Coming forth*, or *Nativity*, which He ſpeaks of, in that Chapter. Some indeed have thought, that *Novatian* underſtands not the word, *Semper*, there, in the ſtrict Senſe, of unlimited Duration: Wherein, I humbly conceive, They are miſtaken. I have tranſcribed the [f] Paſſage into the Margin, and ſhall proceed to explain its meaning. After the Author had ſaid, *Semper*

a De Decret. Synod. Nic. p. 233. Ed. Bened.

b Ἵνα τολμήσας τις ἀρχὴν δῷ εἶναι υἱῷ πρότερον οὐκ ὄντος.

c Τῷ ἀεὶ συνόντος αὐτῷ λόγῳ μονογενῶς.

d Semper enim in Patre, ne Pater non ſemper Pater, *c.* 31.

e Et qui in Patre fuit, proceſſit ex Patre: & qui in Patre fuit, quia ex Patre fuit, cum Patre poſtmodum fuit, quia ex Patre proceſſit, *c.* 31.

f Hic ergo cum ſit genitus a Patre, *Semper* eſt in Patre. *Semper* autem ſic dico, ut non innatum, ſed natum probem; Sed qui *ante omne Tempus eſt*, *Semper* in Patre fuiſſe dicendus eſt: nec enim Tempus Illi aſſignari poteſt, qui *ante Tempus* eſt. *Semper* enim in Patre, ne Pater non *Semper* ſit Pater; quia & Pater Illum etiam præcedit, quod neceſſe eſt prior Sit quà Pater Sit: quoniam antecedat neceſſe eſt Eum, qui habet Originem, Ille qui Originem neſcit.

eſt

eſt in Patre, He immediately adds a ſentence which ſhows that He underſtood, *Semper*, as we ſay, *a parte ante*. But withal there is a ſeeming Reſtriction: *Sic dico, ut non Innatum ſed natum probem.* There might be ſome *then*, as well as *now*, who knew not how to diſtinguiſh between ETERNITY, and SELF-EXISTENCE. The *Sabellians*, in particular, might pretend that the Son, being *Eternal*, muſt be the *Self-exiſtent* Father Himſelf. It was therefore neceſſary for the Author to guard, in the manner He does, againſt any ſuch Miſtake, or Miſconſtruction. So *Alexander* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, while He maintains the ſtrict Eternity of the Son, to guard againſt the invidious Miſconſtruction of the *Arians*, inſerts the like Caution *. " Let no Man, ſays He, miſtake " *Eternal*, as if it were the ſame with *Self-* " *exiſtent*, as (*the Arians*) having their minds " blinded, are wont to do. This may ſerve for a good Comment upon *Novatian*. To proceed: *Novatian* adds; Qui *ante omne Tempus* eſt, *Semper in Patre fuiſſe dicendus eſt.* Here He explains, *Semper*, by, *ante omne Tempus.* Now, this is the very ſame, with Him, as if He had ſaid of the Son, *quod non aliquando cæperit*; as may appear by the † Account He gives of the *Eternity* of the Father; explain-

* *See* p. 123.

† Niſi forte (quod abſit) *aliquando eſſe cæperit*, nec ſuper omnia ſit, ſed dum poſt aliquid eſſe cæperit, intra (leg. *infra*) id ſit quod ante Ipſum fuerit, minor inventus poteſtate, dum poſterior denotatur etiam *Ipſo Tempore.* Novat. c. 2. *Mark the Force of the words,*

ing

ing it by his not being *poſterior* to *Time:* And his having no Time before, is the very ſame, with having nothing [a] *preceding*. Wherefore, when *Novatian* ſpeaks afterwards of the Father's being *precedent* to the Son, He can mean it only in order of *Nature*, not in reſpect of *Duration*. And this I take to have been the meaning of the Catholick Writers, before and after the riſe of *Arianiſm*, by the Phraſes *ante Tempus*, πρὸ αἰώνων, πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων, or the like, as applied to God the Son. So [b] *Hilary*, in the Name of the generality of the Chriſtians of his Time, interprets it: So *Alexander* of *Alexandria*, in his Letter extant in *Theodorit*; the [d] *Sardican Fathers* in their *Synodical* Epiſtle; and the [e] *Catholick* Biſhops, upon the opening of the *Council* of *Ariminum*. Thus alſo we are to underſtand, πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, in the *Conſtantinopolitan* Creed. The [f] *Arians* indeed, equivocating upon the Words, *Time*, and *Ages*, eluded the Catholick Senſe, ſtill retaining the Catholick Expreſſions: But the *Ante-Nicene* Catholicks were ſincere, plain,

Etiam Ipſo; *intimating that Poſteriority in Time is a low degree of Poſteriority, and that a Thing might be ſaid to be* poſterior *in a higher Senſe than that:* viz. *in* Order of Nature, *as we term it.*

a Id quod ſine Origine eſt, præcedi a nullo poteſt, dum non habet Tempus. *Ibid.* Tempus *here manifeſtly ſignifies* Duration, *in the largeſt Senſe; not* Time, *in the reſtrain'd Senſe, as the* Arians *afterwards underſtood it.*

b Audiunt *ante Tempora*; putant id ipſum, *ante Tempora*, eſſe quod *Semper* eſt. Contr. Aux. p. 1266. *Comp.* Trin. l. 12. p. 1129.

c Eccl. Hiſt. l. 1. c. 4. p. 13, *&c.*

d Apud Theod. E. H. l. 2. c. 8. p. 80, 81.

e Hilar. Fragm. p. 1343. Ed. Bened.

f *See* Athanaſ. Vol. 1. p. 418. Hilar. 1129. Epiphan. Hær. 74. pag. 887.

honeſt

honeſt Men; and do not ſeem to have known any thing of thoſe ſubtile Diſtinctions. They underſtood thoſe Phraſes as they would be commonly underſtood by the People; otherwiſe they would not have uſed them, without greater caution and reſerve. * *Siſinnius* long ago obſerved (which confirms what I have been mentioning) that the Antients never would attribute any Beginning to the *Son* of God, believing Him to have been *Co-eternal* with the Father. The curious Reader may obſerve the uſe of thoſe Phraſes, in the places refer'd to in the † Margin; all of them admitting, moſt of them requiring, the Senſe I contend for. I mention not the *Interpolator* of *Ignatius*'s Epiſtles, an *Arian*, probably, of the fourth Century, or later. To return to *Novatian:* when He adds, *Tempus illi aſſignari non poteſt:* He does not mean only, that no particular Time of the Son's Exiſtence is *aſſignable*; but, that it was before all Time, as Himſelf expounds it, *ante Tempus eſt*, i. e. ſtrictly *Eternal*; which agrees with what follows, and makes it Senſe: *Semper enim in Patre, ne Pater non ſemper ſit Pater.* What can be more expreſs for the *Eternity* of the Son, than to declare that the Father was never without Him? He plainly

* Socrat. E. H. l. 5. c. 10.

† Ignatius ad Magneſ. c. 6. p. 22. Juſtin. Fragm. in Grab. Spic. Vol. 2. p. 199. Melito in Cav. H. L. Vol. 2. p. 33. Origen. in Pamph. Apolog. Hippolytus Fragm. Fabric. Vol. 2. p. 29. Concil. Antioch. Contr. Paul. Sam. Lab. Tom. 1. Dionyſ. Alexandr. Reſp. Contr. Paul. Q. 4. Lucian. Symb. apud. Socr. l. 2. c. 10. *Vid. etiam Suicer. Theſaur. in voce,* Αἰών.

ſuppoſes

ſuppoſes it abſurd to ſay, that the Father was ever no Father, or, which comes to the ſame, that ever the Son was not. What follows therefore, in that Chapter, of the Father, *præcedit*, and *antecedat neceſſe eſt*, &c. can only be underſtood of a *priority* of *Nature*, not of Time, or *Duration*; and in This all Catholicks agreed. You'l excuſe my dwelling ſo long upon *Novatian:* it was neceſſary, to clear his Senſe, and to obviate ſome * ſpecious Pretences, not only againſt *Novatian*, but other Catholick Writers of whoſe meaning there is leſs diſpute. From hence may be underſtood in what Senſe all the *Oriental* Biſhops (if the Fact be true, relying only on the doubtful Credit of † *Arius*) might teach, προϋπάρχειν τῦ ὑῦ τ̃ Θεοῦ ἀνάρχως. That it could not be meant in *Arius*'s Senſe, is ſufficiently evident from the determination of the *Nicene* Fathers, which has infinitely more weight in it than his ſingle Teſtimony; and ſhows the Senſe of the whole Church, in a manner, at that Time. But enough of this: I ſhall only remark, before I part with *Novatian*, that He is an Evidence both for the *Firſt*, and *Second* Nativity, or Generation, of the Son. As He ſuppoſes the Son exiſting before the *Proceſſion*, (which is the *voluntary* Nativity He ſpeaks of) and pre-exiſting *as a* ‡ *Son*, He cannot be un-

* Whitby. Modeſt Diſq. pref. p. 29, 30. Proem. p. 5. Lib. p. 166.

† Apud Theodorit. E. H. l. 1. c. 5. p. 21.

‡ Sive dum *Verbum* eſt, ſive dum *Virtus* eſt, ſive dum *Sapientia* eſt, ſive dum *Lux* eſt, ſive dum *Filius* eſt; non ex ſe eſt, quia nec

derſtood

derſtood otherwiſe. See this more fully explain'd in [a] Biſhop *Bull*. If any other Writers, who expreſly held an *eternal* Generation, any where ſpeak alſo of a temporal *Proceſſion*, or *Nativity*, the ſame may be true of Them alſo. I only give this hint, by the way, and paſs on.

[b] *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*, who lived about the ſame time with *Novatian*, aſſerts the ſame Doctrine; *viz.* That the Father was *always* Father; and *never* was without his Son: which is the ſame as to maintain *eternal Generation*. The ſame Doctrine is farther confirm'd, and more explicitely ſet forth, in his [c] Epiſtle againſt *Paul* of *Samoſata*; [d] if it be his.

[e] *Dionyſius*, Biſhop of *Rome*, Contemporary with the other, declares that the *Son is eternal*, and that there *never was a time when the Son was not*; adding in Confirmation of it, that He is the *Word*, the *Wiſdom*, and the *Power* of God. This, tho' it be expreſs for

innatus eſt. *That is, He is* natus, *conſider'd under any Capacity; whether as* λόγος, δύναμις, *or* σοφία, *or* φῶς, *or* ἡλός, *whether before the Proceſſion, or after. This ſeems to be the moſt probable Conſtruction of the Paſſage; and moſt Conſonant to what He had ſaid before.*

a D. F. p. 222.

b Οὐ γὰρ ἦν ὅτε ὁ Θεὸς οὐκ ἦν πατήρ. ——— ὁ γὰρ δὴ, τέκνων ἄρχων ὤν, ὁ Θεὸς, εἶτα ἐπαιδοποιήσατο. Athan. Vol. 1. p. 253.

c Labb. Concil. Tom. 1. p. 853. 872. 864.

d *See* Thirlby's *Defence of it: Anſw. to* Whiſton, *part* 2. *p.* 48. *&c.*

e Εἰ γὰρ γέγονεν ἡλός, ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν· ἀεὶ δὲ ἦν εἰ γε ἐν τῷ πατρὶ ἐστιν, ὡς αὐτὸς φησι, καὶ εἰ λόγος, καὶ σοφία, καὶ δύναμις ὁ Χριστός. apud Athanaſ. Decret. Syn. N. 232. Εἰ τοίνυν γέγονεν ὁ ἡλός, ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν πιστεύω· ἦν ἄρα καιρὸς, ὅτε χωρὶς τέκνων ἦν ὁ Θεός· ἀτοπώτατον δὲ τοῦτο. Ibid. *This and* Novatian's *Teſtimony, Both of the ſame Age, may ſerve to illuſtrate each other.*

the

the Eternity of the Son, yet is not full for *eternal Generation*; unless it had been said, Eternal, *as a Son*. He might be supposed Eternal, as the Λόγος, and his *Sonship* commence afterwards. And therefore I do not put this among the *clear*, *unexceptionable* Authorities for *eternal Generation*; though hardly any reasonable doubt can be made of it, since He suppos'd the Father, the *Head*, *Root*, *Origin* of the Λόγος.

* *Methodius* speaks more close and home to the Point. For, upon the words of the *Psalmist: Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee*; He comments thus. "It is observable that his being a Son, is here indefinitely express'd without any Limitation of Time. For He said, *Thou art*, not *Thou becam'st* my Son; signifying that He did not acquire any *new Filiation*, nor should ever have an end of his Existence, but that He is *always the same*. He † goes on to speak of his after-*Filiation*, intimated in the words, *This day have I begotten Thee*; and observes, that it was more properly a *Manifestation* of Him; consonant to what He had said before, that He could not have a *new* Filiation. This may relate either to what I before called his *Second*, or to his *Third* Genera-

* Παρατηρητέον γὰρ ὅτι τὸ μὲν υἱὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι ἀορίστως ἀπεφήνατο, καὶ ἀχρόνως· εἰ γὰρ υἱὸς, αὐτῷ ἔφη, καὶ ὁ, γέγονας· ἐμφαίνων, μήτε πρόσφατον αὐτὸν τετυχηκέναι τῆς υἱοθεσίας, μήτε αὖ προϋπάρξαντα τέλος ἐσχηκέναι, ἀλλ' εἶναι ἀεὶ τὸν αὐτόν. Apud Phot. Cod. 237. p. 960.

† Προόντα ἤδη πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἐβουλήθην καὶ τῷ κόσμῳ γεννῆσαι, ὃ δή ἐστι, πρόσθεν ἀγνοούμενον γνωρίσαι. Ibid.

tion

tion: The Words are ambiguous, and capable of either Senſe.

To *Methodius* I may ſubjoin *Pamphilus*, who, while He delivers *Origen*'s Senſe, in his Apology, does undoubtedly ſpeak his own too. He is very * clear and full for the *eternal* Generation, if we may rely on the Tranſlator.

Alexander, Biſhop of *Alexandria*, † reckons it among the Singularities of *Arius*, that He would not own the Father to have been *always* ſo; but pretended that God was once *no Father*, and that the Λόγος was produced in Time. I obſerve, that theſe two Things are here join'd together, as being Explanatory one of the other, according to the reaſoning of that Age, at leaſt. And if the ſame reaſoning held before, as may be probably infer'd from ‡ other Paſſages of the Antients, then it will follow that as many as aſſerted the *Eternity* of the Λόγος, or Word, which were all without Exception, did implicitely maintain the *eternal Generation*. It appears to have been a Maxim in the Church at this Time, that is, about the Year 315, Ten Years before the

* Inter Op. Orig. Ed. Baſil. p. 877.

† Οὐκ ἀεὶ ὁ Θεὸς πατὴρ ἦν. ἀλλ' ἦν ὅτε ὁ Θεὸς πατὴρ οὐκ ἦν. οὐκ ἀεὶ ἦν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος, ἀλλ' ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων γέγονεν. Alexand. Ep. apud Socr. E. H. l. 1. c. 6. p. 10. Ἀσεβεστάτης οὖν φανείσης τῆς ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ὑποθέσεως, ἀνάγκη τὸν πατέρα ἀεὶ εἶναι πατέρα. Alexand. Ep. apud Theod. l. 1. c. 4. p. 13.

‡ *The Charge brought againſt* Dionyſius *of* Alexandria; *and which He clear'd Himſelf of, was This:* Οὐκ ἀεὶ ἦν ὁ Θεὸς πατήρ; οὐκ ἀεὶ ἦν υἱός, ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν Θεὸς ἦν χωρὶς τοῦ λόγου. αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ υἱὸς οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γεννηθῇ, ἀλλ' ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν. Athan. Ep. de Sentent. Dionyſ. p. 253.

Council

Council of *Nice*, that the *Father was always Father*. The same we have seen, about Sixty years before, from what has been cited out of *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, and *Novatian*. The Testimony of * *Origen*, cited by *Pamphilus*, with others mention'd, carry it up Forty Years higher, to about the Year 210. *Irenæus*, above Thirty Years higher, to about 173, within less than fourscore Years of St. *John*. *Tertullian*, betwixt the Two last named, seems to have understood this matter differently: For He says plainly, that † *there was a Time, when the Son was not*; meaning, *as a Son*; and that God *was not always Father*. And this is agreeable to his Principles, who always speaks of the *Generation* as a voluntary Thing, and brought about in Time; as do several other Writers. From hence a Question may arise, whether there was any Difference of Doctrine between those Writers, or a Difference in Words only. This is a Point which will deserve a most strict and careful Inquiry.

The Authors who make the Generation *Temporary*, and speak not expressly of any other, are these following: *Justin*, *Athenagoras*, *Theophilus*, *Tatian*, *Tertullian*, and *Hippo-*

* Non enim Deus, cum prius non esset Pater, postea Pater esse cæpit, *&c. Pamphil. Apol.* p. 877.

† Pater Deus est, & Judex Deus est, non tamen ideo Pater & Judex *semper*, quia Deus semper. Nam nec Pater esse potuit ante Filium, nec Judex ante delictum. Fuit autem Tempus cum & delictum & *Filius* non fuit. *Tertul. Contr. Hermog.* c. 3.

lytus. *Novatian* I mention not with Them, because He asserted Both. Let us then carefully examine what their Doctrine was: And that it may be done the more distinctly, let us reduce it to Particulars.

1. They asserted the *Co-eternity* of the Λόγος, or *Word*, tho' not consider'd precisely under the formality of a *Son*. This, I presume, is so clear a point, that I need not burthen my Margin with Quotations for it. It shall suffice only to refer to the * Places, if any should doubt of it. It was a Maxim with Them, that God was always Λογικὸς, never Ἄλογος; that is, never without his *Word*, or *Wisdom*. So far they agreed perfectly with the other Writers, either before, or after, or in their own Time. The Antients, supposing the Relation of the Λόγος to the Father to be as close and intimate as that of *Thought* to a *Mind*; and that this was insinuated in the very *Name*, rightly concluded that the Father could not be Ἄλογος, or without the Λόγος, any more than an eternal Mind could be without eternal Thought †. Some have pretended that the *Ante-Nicene* Writers, who used that kind of reasoning, meant only an *Attribute*, by the Λόγος; and not a *real Person*. But there's no ground or colour

* Justin. Martyr. Apol. 1. p. 122. Ox. Ed. Athenag. Legat. c. 10. p. 39. Ed. Ox. Theophilus Antioch. p. 82. 129. Ed. Ox. Tatian. p. 20. 22. Ed. Ox. *Vid. Bull.* D. F. p. 209. Tertull. Contr. Prax. c. 5. p. 503. c. 27. *Vid. Bull.* D. F. p. 245. Hippolyt. Contr. Noet. c. 10. p. 13. *Edit. Fabric.*

† *See* Bull D. F. p. 206,

for

for this Pretence, as shall be shown presently. I shall only note here, that the * *Post-Nicene* Writers, who, undoubtedly and confessedly, took the Λόγος to be a *Person*; a *real*, eternal Person; yet make use of the same Maxim, and the very same way of reasoning.

2. They did not mean by the Λόγος, or *Word*, any *Attribute*, *Power*, *Virtue*, or *Operation* of the Father; but a real, subsisting Person: whom they believed to have been always in and with the Father, and distinct from Him, before the *Temporary* Generation they speak of. If this be well proved, other Matters, as we shall see presently, will be easily adjusted.

The learned and judicious † Bishop *Bull* has sufficiently shown, of every Author singly, (except *Justin*, whom He reckons not with Them) that He must be understood to have believed the real and distinct Personality of the Son; before the Temporary *Procession*, or *Generation* mention'd. His reasonings, upon that Head, have not been answer'd, and, I am perswaded, cannot: So that I might very well spare my Self the labour of adding any Thing farther. But for the sake of such, as will not be at the Pains to read or consider what He has said at large; I shall endeavor to throw the Substance

* Athanas. Vol. 1. p. 424. 500. 619. Et alibi. Greg. Nyss. Cat. Orat. c. 1. Cyrill. l. 4. in Joh. c. 48. Thesaur. p. 12. 23. Damasc. l. 1. Marc. Diadoch. p. 115.

† Defens. F. N. Sect. 3. c. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.

of it into a ſmaller Compaſs, in the following Particulars: Only premiſing this, that ſince all theſe Authors, went, in the main, upon the ſame *Hypotheſis*; They are the beſt Commentators one upon another: And whatever Explication we meet with in any one, two, or three, may reaſonably ſtand for the Senſe of All; if they have nothing Contradictory to it. Now to proceed.

1. * Before the *Proceſſion*, or *Generation*, of which they ſpeak, they ſuppoſe the Father *not* to have been *alone*; which it is hard to make Senſe of, if they only meant that He was with his own Attributes, Powers, or Perfections: As much as to ſay, He was *wiſe*, and *great*, and powerful by *Himſelf*; therefore He was *not alone*. *Alone*, indeed, they own Him to have been, with reſpect to any Thing *ad extra*; but with reſpect to what was in Himſelf, He was not *alone*; not *ſingle*, but conſiſting of a *Plurality*, having the Λόγος always with Him.

2. The ſame Λόγος, or Word, was always † with Him; convers'd with Him; was, as it

* Μόνος ἦν ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ὁ λόγος. Theoph. p. 130. Αὐτὸς δὲ μόνος ὢν πολὺς ἦν, οὔτε γὰρ ἄλογος, οὔτε ἄσοφος, οὔτε ἀδύνατος, οὔτε ἀβούλευτος ἦν. *All which Words correſpond to the ſeveral Names of the Son or Holy Spirit*; λόγος, σοφία, δύναμις, βουλὴ, (τοῦ πατρὸς) *and mean the ſame Thing.* Hippolyt. p. 13. Contr. Noet.

Solus autem, quia nihil extrinſecus præter illum, cæterum ne tunc quidem Solus. Habebat enim ſecum, quam habebat in ſemetipſo, Rationem ſuam ſcilicet. *Tertull. Contr. Prax.* c. 5. p. 503.

† Σὺν αὐτῷ γὰρ, διὰ λογικῆς δυνάμεως, αὐτὸς καὶ ὁ λόγος, ὃς ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ, ὑπίστησε. Tatian. c. 7. p. 20. Ὁ ἀεὶ συμπαρὼν αὐτῷ.

were

were, assisting in Council, according to those Writers; and therefore, certainly, a distinct Person. It would be very improper to say that God was [a] *in*, or *with* one of his Attributes, or *consulted* with it: All such Expressions must denote a distinct Personality.

3. The same individual Λόγος, who after the *Procession* was undoubtedly a *Person*, is supposed to have existed before. [b] *Novatian* is express. "He who was in the Father, proceeded from the Father. It is the same individual Λόγος, according to [c] *Theophilus*, who is διαπαντὸς, always, both before and after his Procession, with the Father; and therefore, if He was a *real Person* after, which is not disputed, He must have been so before. That [d] very Λόγος, or Word, which had been from all Eternity ἐνδιάθετος, ἐν καρδίᾳ Θεοῦ, becomes afterwards προφορικός. If therefore He was ever

Theoph. p. 82. Τὸν ὄντα διαπαντὸς ἐνδιάθετον ἐν καρδίᾳ Θεοῦ. Id. p. 129. *A little after*, Τοῦτον εἶχε σύμβουλον, ἑαυτοῦ νοῦν καὶ φρόνησιν ὄντα ——— τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ διαπαντὸς ὁμιλῶν. Id. p. 129.

Si necessaria est Deo materia ad opera mundi, ut *Hermogenes* existimavit; Habuit Deus materiam longe digniorem —— *Sophiam* suam scilicet. ——— Sophia autem Spiritus: Hæc Illi *Consiliarius* fuit. *Tert Contr. Hermog.*

a Θεὸς ἦν ἐν Ἀρχῇ. τὴν δὲ ἀρχὴν λόγου δύναμιν παρειλήφαμεν· Tat. p. 19.

b Qui in Patre fuit, processit ex Patre, p. 31. Zeno Veronensis, *of the following Century, expresses it thus:* procedit in Nativitatem, qui erat antequam nasceretur, in Patre. *Which I add for Illustration.*

c Pag. 129.

d Τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ἐγέννησε προφορικόν. Theoph. p. 129. Φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς γεννῶν, προῆκεν τῇ κτίσει κύριον, τὸν ἴδιον νοῦν αὐτῷ μόνῳ πρότερον ὁρατὸν ὑπάρχοντα. Hippol. c. 10. p. 13. Νοῦς, ὃς προβὰς ἐν κόσμῳ ἐδείκνυτο παῖς Θεοῦ. c. 11. pag. 14. *Compare* Theoph. pag. 129. *before cited.*

a *Perſon*, He muſt have been ſo always. So again: The Λόγος that ſpake to the Prophets, and who was undoubtedly *a Perſon*, is the [a] very ſame individual Λόγος, which was always with the Father; ὁ ἀεὶ συμπαρὼν αὐτῷ. *Tertullian*, who diſtinguiſhes between *Ratio*, and *Sermo*; and aſſerts the former to be *Eternal*, and the latter to be a *Perſon*; yet [b] connects Both in one; and makes Them, in Subſtance, the very ſame; the ſelf-ſame *Perſon* Both: only ſuppoſed under different Capacities and different Names, before, and after the *Proceſſion*. It was one and the ſame *Hypoſtaſis*; once *Ratio* (according to this Writer) and as ſuch, Eternal; afterwards *Sermo*, and as ſuch, [c] a *Son*. The ſeeming difference between the antient Fathers upon this Point is eaſily reconciled, ſays a [d] very worthy and learned *Prelate* of our "Church. One ſaith, God was not *Sermonalis* "*a principio*, or his *Word* did not exiſt till the "Creation; others ſay, Chriſt is Λόγος Ἀΐδιος, "*the Eternal Word*, of the Father. They "may all be underſtood, in a ſound Senſe, "with the help of this Diſtinction. The "*Word*, as He is *inward* Speech formed from "the Eternal Mind, was for ever with God:

a Theoph. p. 81, 82.

b In uſu eſt noſtrorum—*Sermonem* dicere in primordio apud Deum fuiſſe, cum magis *Rationem* competat antiquiorem haberi; quia non Sermonalis a principio, ſed Rationalis Deus etiam ante principium, & quia ipſe quoque *Sermo Ratione* conſiſtens, priorem eam ut *Subſtantiam ſuam* oſtendat. *Contr. Prax.* c. 5.

c *See* Bull. *Sect.* 3. *c.* 10.

d *Biſhop of* Lichfield *and* Coventry, *Serm. p.* 13, 14.

"But

" But as God's Agent to display and *sound*
" *forth* the Wisdom of God in external Works,
" *as such*, He existed not till the Creation ——
" the Creation being, as it were, a *verbal* Ex-
" plication of what *Reason* had first silently
" thought, disposed, and resolved within it self.

4. If there still remains any doubt of this Matter, there is a farther Argument to be urg'd, which may be justly look'd upon as clear, full, and decisive in the Case. Had these Fathers believed that the Λόγος, or Word, was an *Attribute* only, or *Power*, &c. before the *Procession*, or *Generation*, which they speak of; then it would follow, that the Son began first to be, and was properly a *Creature*, ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, in their Opinion; and that *Procession* was but another word for being *created*. But these Writers do expressly guard against any such Notion. * *Novatian* very clearly distinguishes between *Procession* and *Creation*. *Athenagoras*, is still more express to the same purpose; † declaring that the Son was not then *made*, but had existed in the Father, as the Λόγος, or Word, from all Eternity.

Justin Martyr is the first, and the most considerable of those Writers; and therefore it will be proper to examine his Sentiments with a more particular care and exactness. I have se-

* Si Homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo dicit. *Ego ex Deo prodii*, Joh. 16. —— cum constat, Hominem a Deo *Factum esse*, non ex Deo *Processisse*? c. 23.

† Οὐχ ὡς γενόμενον; ἐξ Ἀρχῆς γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς νοῦς αἰδιος ὢν, εἶχεν αὐτὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸν λόγον ἀϊδίως λογικὸς ὤν, c. 10. p. 39.

lected the most material Passages I could find, which may help to give us a just Idea of his Doctrine; and have placed Them in distinct Columns, in the * Margin. It would signify little to translate Them; because the Arguments arising from them are proper only to Scholars. I have distinguish'd the several Citations by Figures, for the more convenient referring to Them.

1. I observe, first, (*See* N. 1, 2.) that He makes ἀγέννητος, equivalent to ἄφθαρτος and ἀΐδιος;

1. * Ὁ μὲν γὰρ Μωϋσῆς ὁ ὤν, ἔφη ὁ δὲ Πλάτων, τὸ ὄν. ἑκάτερον δὲ τῶν εἰρημένων τῷ ἀεὶ ὄντι Θεῷ προσήκειν φαίνεται· αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστι μόνος ὁ ἀεὶ ὢν γένεσιν δὲ μὴ ἔχων —— εὑρήσομεν γὰρ αὐτὸν — τὸν μὲν ἀγέννητον ἀΐδιον εἶναι λέγοντα· τοὺς δὲ γεννητοὺς ἢ δημιουργητοὺς — γενομένους καὶ ἀπολλυμένους. Paræn, p. 90, 91. Ox.

2. Ὅσα γάρ ἐστι μετὰ τὸν Θεὸν ἢ ἔσται ποτὲ, ταῦτα φύσιν φθαρτὴν ἔχειν, καὶ οἷά τε ἐξαφανισθῆναι καὶ μὴ εἶναι ἔτι. μόνος γὰρ ἀγέννητος καὶ ἄφθαρτος Θεὸς, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο Θεός ἐστι. Dial. p. 21. Jebb.

3. Ἐγὼ γὰρ, φησὶν, εἰμὶ ὁ ὤν. ἀντιδιαστέλλων ἑαυτὸν δηλονότι ὁ ὢν τοῖς μὴ οὖσιν. Paræn. p. 87.

4. Ὄνομα τῶν πάντων πατρὶ θετὸν, ἀγεννήτῳ ὄντι, οὐκ ἔστιν. ᾧ γὰρ ἂν καὶ ὀνόματι προσαγορεύηται, πρεσβύτερον ἔχει τὸν θέμενον τὸ ὄνομα. τὸ δὲ Πατὴρ, καὶ Θεὸς, καὶ Κτίστης, καὶ Κύριος, καὶ Δεσπότης οὐκ ὀνόματά ἐστιν ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν εὐποιϊῶν καὶ τῶν ἔργων προσρήσεις. Apol. 2. p. 13. Θεῷ δὲ οὔτε ὁ τιθεὶς ὄνομα, προϋπῆρχεν, οὔτε αὐτὸς ἑαυτὸν ὀνομάζειν ὠήθη δεῖν εἷς καὶ μόνος ὑπάρχων, p. 86.

5. Ἰουδαῖοι οὖν ἡγησάμενοι ἀεὶ τὸν πατέρα τῶν ὅλων λελαληκέναι τῷ Μωσεῖ, τοῦ λαλήσαντος αὐτῷ ὄντος υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃς καὶ ἄγγελος καὶ ἀπόστολος κέκληται, δικαίως ἐλέγχονται καὶ διὰ τοῦ προφητικοῦ πνεύματος, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς οὔτε τὸν πατέρα οὔτε τὸν υἱὸν ἔγνωσαν —— ὃς καὶ λόγος πρωτότοκος ὢν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ Θεὸς ὑπάρχει. Apol. 1. p. 122, 123.

Compare the Citations before given in p. 37.

6. Ὁ δὲ υἱὸς ἐκείνου, ὁ μόνος λεγόμενος κυρίως υἱὸς, ὁ λόγος πρὸ τῶν ποιημάτων καὶ συνὼν, καὶ γεννώμενος ὅτε τὴν ἀρχὴν δι' αὐτοῦ πάντα ἔκτισε καὶ ἐκόσμησε, Χριστὸς μὲν κατὰ τὸ κεχρίσθαι καὶ κοσμῆσαι τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ τὸν Θεὸν, λέγεται, ὄνομα καὶ αὐτὸ περιέχον ἄγνωστον σημασίαν· ὃν τρόπον καὶ τὸ Θεὸς προσαγόρευμα οὐκ ὄνομά ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ πράγματος δυσεξηγήτου ἔμφυτος τῇ φύσει τῶν ἀνθρώπων δόξα. Apol. 2. p. 14. Ox.

oppo-

opposing it to φθαρτὸς, γενόμενος, δημιουργητός, and ἀπολλύμενος: Here therefore, * ἀγέννητος, is not consider'd as the personal Character of the Father and as signifying *unbegotten*; but as it belongs to the τὸ θεῖον, and denotes eternal, uncreated, immutable Existence. Either *Justin* must have believed that ἀγέννητος, in this latter Sense, is applicable to the Son; or else it follows that He supposed Him, not only γεννητὸς, but γενόμενος, δημιουργητὸς, and φθαρτὸς also, which must appear highly absurd to any one who has ever consider'd *Justin*'s Writings.

2. I observe (*See* N. 2.) that God's being ἀγέννητος and ἄφθαρτος is supposed the very Ground and Foundation of his being *God*; on account of which He is θεὸς; and without which, consequently, He could not be θεός. If therefore the Λόγος be not, in this Sense, ἀγέννητος and ἄφθαρτος, He is not θεὸς, according to *Justin Martyr*: And yet no Man is more express than *Justin*, every where, in making the Son θεὸς, and insisting very much upon it.

3. *Justin* makes ὁ ὢν equivalent to the Platonists τὸ ὄν. (*See* N. 1.) And either of them

* *I need but hint that the words* ἀγέννητος *and* ἀγένητος, *with double or single* ν, *have been used very promiscuously in Authors; and hardly came to be accurately distinguish'd, till the* Arian *Controversy gave occasion for it. See* Suicer's Thesaurus, *upon the Ecclesiastical use of these Words; and* Cudworth *for profane Writers,* p. 253, 254. *The Son is properly* ἀγένητος, *as well as the Father; so* Ignatius, *so* Irenæus, *so* Origen *expressly stiles Him; and* Athenagoras's ὁ γενόμενος, *is to the same effect. The similitude of the Word and Sound was, very probably, the chief Reason why the Title of* ἀγέννητος *was not oftner applied to the Son; which Omission however is compensated by other equivalent Expressions.*

equi-

equivalent to ἀεὶ ὢν, and that to γένεσιν μὴ ἔχων, uncreated, immutable, neceſſarily-exiſting. Now compare *N.* 5. and two more Citations given above, *pag.* 37. and from thence it is manifeſt that *Juſtin* makes the Λόγος to be ὁ ὢν, in his own proper Perſon. And He gives the reaſon here why, or on what Account, He might juſtly ſtile Himſelf Θεὸς (and the ſame muſt hold for ὁ ὢν) it is becauſe *He is* Θεὸς, as God's Son; πρωτότοκος ὢν τῦ Θεῦ, ϗ Θεὸς ὑπάρχῃ *.

4. I obſerve, that *Juſtin Martyr*, having taken notice that the Father had properly no Name, (*See* N. 4. 6.) as having nothing antecedent or pre-exiſtent, does, immediately after, repeat the Obſervation of having no Name, and applies it to the Son; obſerving that neither He, properly, has any Name, but only ſome Titles or Appellations given Him, from what He did in Time; particularly from His coming forth to create and put into beautiful Order the whole Syſtem of Things. This ſeems to inſinuate his *Co-eternity* with the Father; and the more ſo, becauſe *Juſtin* obſerves, at the ſame time, that He is *emphatically* Son of the Father, (ὁ μόνῳ λεγόμενῳ κυρίως υἱὸς,) and *Co-exiſtent* (συνὼν) with his Father, before the World; tho' begotten or ſent forth, in time, to create the Univerſe. Theſe Conſiderations convince me that *Juſtin*, as well as *Athenagoras*,

* *Compare* Dial. p. 364. 183. 371. 184. Ed. Jebb. *I add for Illuſtration theſe Words of* Cyril. Ὅπερ ἂν ἐξ ἀγενήτε καὶ ἀφθάρτε γεγένηται, τῦτο πάντως ἄφθαρτον, ϗ ἀγένητον. Cyril. Alex. Theſaur. p. 34.

taught

taught the ſtrict *Co-eternity* of the Son; which is equally true of all the other Writers.

Beſides this, the ſeveral * Similitudes, which theſe Authors uſed, to illuſtrate the Nature of that *Proceſſion*; ſuch as the *Sun and its Rays*, the *Fountain and its Streams*, the *Root and its Branches*, one *Fire lighting another*, and the like; manifeſtly ſhow, that They never dream'd of the Son's being *created*. Then, the care they took leſt any one ſhould imagine there was any *Diviſion* of the Father's Subſtance; and their inculcating that He was *prolatus, non ſeparatus*; *brought forth*, but not *ſeparated* from the Father, demonſtrate their meaning to be, that here was no Production of a new Subſtance, but an *Emanation*, *Manifeſtation*, or *Proceſſion* of what was before. Farther, their declaring that, tho' He proceeded from the Father, He was ſtill in the Father, (taken together with the † Maxim, that *nothing is in God but what is God*) ſets the matter beyond all reaſonable Scruple. In a word; as they all held the *Conſubſtantiality* of the Son with the Father, which is as clear as the Light, in their Writings; they muſt have

* Juſtin. M. Dial. p. 183. 373. Jebb. Athenagoras p. 40. 96. Ox. Ed. Tatian, c. 8. p. 21, 22. Ox. Ed. Tertull. Apol. c. 21. Adv. Prax. c. 8. Hippolytus Contr. Noet. c. 11. p. 13. Contr. Jud. p. 4. Fabric. Vol. 2.

N. B. Athenagoras's *words are, in ſtrictneſs, meant of the* Holy Ghoſt *only, in Both places. But the reaſon being the ſame for one as the other, they are equally applicable to Either; and it is thus only I would be underſtood, wherever I apply either of the Paſſages to the* Son.

† Vid. Bull D. F. N. p. 198.

been

been the moſt inconſiſtent Men in the World, had they thought that the *Proceſſion*, or *Generation* of the Son, was a *Creation*, or *new Production* of Him; or had they not firmly believed that He exiſted, the *living* and *ſubſtantial Word*, from all Eternity.

Juſtin Martyr ſeems to have ſpoke the Senſe of all, in ſaying, "That the Λόγος co-exiſted with "the Father before the Creatures; and was then "begotten, when the Father at firſt created and "put into beautiful Order the Frame of Things. See the paſſage above *. The *Emperor Conſtantine* afterwards expreſſes the ſame Thought, ſomething more fully and diſtinctly, thus. "† The Son, who was *always* in the Father, "was *begotten*, or rather *proceeded forth*, for "the orderly and ornamental Methodizing of the "Creation. I chuſe to follow the Senſe, rather than the ſtrict Letter. Whether thoſe Writers went upon any ſolid Reaſons, in aſſigning ſuch or ſuch parts, in the work of Creation, to Father, Son, or Holy Ghoſt, is not very material. It is manifeſt, they ſuppoſed the whole Trinity to be concern'd in it; and to Create, as it were, in concert. Their aſcribing the orderly adjuſtment and beautifying part to the Son, ſeems to have been in alluſion to his Names of λόγος, and σοφία, and Φῶς. In reſpect of the laſt of them, *Hippolytus* ſuppoſes the *Generation* to

* P. 152 N. 6. † Ἐγεννήθη, μᾶλλον δὲ προῆλθεν αὐτὸς, ὢν πάντοτε ἐν τῷ πατρὶ ὢν, ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεγονυιῶν διακόσμησιν. Apud Geląſ. Act Syn. Nic. part. 3. p. 58.

be

be posterior to the Creation, upon God's saying, *Let there be Light.* Then did the Son *proceed* Φῶς ἐκ Φωτός. **Tertullian* seems to have had the same Thought, and perhaps, † *Origen. Athenagoras* likewise supposes the *Procession* to be after the Creating of the unformed Mass of Things. And yet nothing is plainer than that ‡ all these Writers believed the *prior* Existence of the Son; and that Things were at first created by Him, as well as afterwards adorned and regulated. In short, whatever the Father is supposed to have done, was by His Son and Holy Spirit; therefore frequently stiled *Manus Patris:* But the Αὐθεντία, the *Designing* part, was thought most properly to be reserved to the Father, as the *first* Person. These are Things not to be too curiously inquired into, or too rigorously interpreted; but to be understood θεοπρεπῶς. In the whole, they have a very good meaning; and were founded in the Belief of a *Co-essential* and *Co-eternal* Trinity.

From what hath been said, I presume, it is evident that there was no difference at all, in the main of the Doctrine, between These, and the other Catholick Writers; but a different

* Contr. Prax. c. 12. † Vid. Huet. Origenian. p. 41.

‡ *As to* Athenagoras, *vid. supra.* Tertullian *says: Deum immutabilem* & informabilem credi necesse est, ut æternum; quodcunque transfiguratur in aliud, desinit esse quod fuerat, & *incipit esse quod non erat.* Deus autem neque desinit esse, neque aliud potest esse; Sermo autem Deus, *&c.* Contr. Prax. c. 27. Hippolytus *hath these words.* Πατρὶ συναΐδιος, adv. Jud. p. 4. Ἀεὶ γὰρ ἦν ἐν δόξῃ θεοπρεπεῖ, τῷ ἰδίῳ συνυπάρχων γεννήτορι πρὸ παντὸς αἰῶνος, καὶ χρόνου, καὶ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου καταβολῆς. Fabric. Vol. 2. p. 29. Origen *we have seen before.*

man-

manner only, of expreſſing the ſame Things. The Queſtion was not, whether the *Hypoſtaſis*, or *Perſon*, of the Son was from all Eternity, co-eval with the Father and conſubſtantial with Him; in That, they all perfectly agreed. Nor was there any difference about the *Proceſſion*: for the * latter Writers acknowledged it as well as Thoſe before them; and made it *Temporary* and *Voluntary*, as Thoſe did. But the Queſtion was, whether, the Son's eternal Co-exiſtence, (I ſhould rather ſay, the co-eternal Exiſtence of the Λόγος) ſhould be deem'd *Sonſhip* and *Filiation* or no; or whether the *Proceſſion* might not more properly be ſo ſtiled. *Tertullian* (and perhaps Others) was of Opinion that this latter was † *perfecta Nativitas Sermonis*; *The perfect Nativity*, or *Birth of the Word*: who had been, as it were, *quieſcent* and *un-operating* from all Eternity, till He came forth to *Create* the *World*: And ‡ *Hippolytus* carried this Notion ſo far, as to think the *Filiation* not *compleated*, till He had run thro' the laſt ſort of Sonſhip, in becoming Man. All this is true, in ſome Senſe, and when rightly explain'd. But other Fathers thinking this way of ſpeaking liable to abuſe and miſ-con-

* Vid. Bull. Def. F. N. Sect. 3. c. 9.

† Contr. Prax. c. 7.

‡ Contr. Noet. c. 15. p. 17. Οὔτε γὰρ ἄσαρκος ἦ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ὁ λόγος τέλειος ἦν υἱὸς, καί τοι τέλειος λόγος ὢν μονογενής. *It is remarkable, that He makes the Son perfectly μονογενὴς, tho' not perfectly υἱὸς, before the* Incarnation. *Others might perhaps reaſon, in like manner, with regard to the* περιέλευσις; *thinking Him to have been* λόγος, *or* μονογενὴς, *before it, but not* υἱὸς.

ſtruction,

ſtruction; and conſidering, probably, that the Λόγος, or Word, might [a] properly be called *Son*, in reſpect of that eternal Exiſtence which He ever enjoyed *in*, and *from* the Father as the Head, Root, Fountain, and cauſe of All; they choſe to give That the Name of *Generation*; and to call the other Two, [b] *Condeſcenſions*, *Manifeſtations*, *Proceeding forth*, or the like. So we have ſeen it in *Methodius*, before cited for the *eternal Generation:* And He, very probably, had the notion from [c] *Juſtin Martyr*; who, in like manner, interprets *Generation*, in the ſecondary Senſe, by *Manifeſtation*. And even [d] *Hippolytus*, as before obſerved, explains the *Proceſſion*, or *Generation* of the Son, a little after the Creation, by *Manifeſtation* of Him.

a Omnis Origo parens eſt; omne quod ex Origine profertur, progenies eſt. *Tertull. Contr. Prax.* c. 8. *See* Novat. *above*, p. 141.

Γεννᾷ μὲν οὖν καὶ ὁ ἥλιος τὴν αὐγήν. Euſ. Eccl. Th. l. 1. c. 12. p. 73.

Τὸ ἔκ τινος ὑπάρχον υἱός ἐστιν ἐκείνου, ἐξ οὗ καὶ ἔστιν. Athan. Orat. 4. p. 628.

b *It is obſervable that* Juſtin Martyr *applies the word* προβάλλω *to the* latter *of them, as well as to the Former.* Dial. 228. Jebb.

And, in like manner, Clement *of* Alexandria *uſes* προελθῶν *of Both,* p. 654. *and* Hippolytus, *of the latter.* Contr. Noet. c. 17.

c *On the words, Thou art* my Son, this day have I begotten Thee; *He comments thus.* Τότε γένεσιν αὐτοῦ λέγων γίνεσθαι τοῖς Ἀνθρώποις, ἐξότου ἡ γνῶσις αὐτοῦ ἔμελλε γίνεσθαι, Dial. p. 270. Ed. Jebb.

d Τὸν ἴδιον νοῦν αὐτῷ μόνῳ πρότερον ὁρατὸν ὑπάρχοντα, τῷ δὲ γινομένῳ κόσμῳ ἀόρατον ὄντα, ὅρατον ποιεῖ. c. 10. p. 13. *A little before He had ſaid* Τῶν δὲ γινομένων ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σύμβουλον καὶ ἐργάτην ἐγέννα λόγον, ὃν λόγον ἔχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἀόρατόν τε ὄντα, τῷ κτιζομένῳ κόσμῳ, ὁρατὸν ποιεῖ, προτέραν φωνὴν φθεγγόμενος, καὶ φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς γεννῶν.

The Words of Zeno Veronenſis *may be added, as a good Comment upon the former.* Cujus (Patris) ex Ore, ut rerum natura, quæ non erat, fingeretur, prodivit Unigenitus Filius, Cordis ejus Nobilis Inquilinus: exinde *viſibilis* effectus, quia Humanum genus viſitaturus erat, *&c.*

After

After *Arius* arose; the Catholicks found it highly necessary to insist much on the *Eternal Generation*. For, the *Arians*, taking advantage of it, that the *Temporary Condescension* of the Son, to create the World, had been often called his *Generation*, were for looking no higher; but artfully insinuated that this was the first *production* of Him; and that it was absurd to talk of the Son's existing before He was *begotten*: in opposition to which pretence, we find the *Nicene Fathers* anathematizing such as should say, that the * *Son existed not before He was* BEGOTTEN; meaning in the Sense now explain'd. However, the *Arians* might have known that the eternal Existence of the Λόγος was universally Taught; and even by those who asserted a Temporal Generation. Nor indeed were they ignorant of it; but † they contrived, for a *Salvo*, to maintain, that the Λόγος, or *Word*, which was held to be *Eternal*, was not the same with the Λόγος, or *Word* begotten; the former being only the Father's own proper *Word*, and no substantial Thing; the latter, a *created* Substance, directly contrary to all Antiquity which has nothing to countenance any such Notion of a *twofold* Λόγος. Upon this, it became necessary to explain in what Sense any *Temporal* Generation had been asserted; and to keep up the true Catholick Doctrine, which had obtain'd

* Ἦν ποτὲ ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν.

† *See* Bull. Def. F. p. 198.

from

from the Beginning; namely, of the Eternal Λόγος distinct from the Father; *Son* of the Father, as partaking of the same divine Substance from all Eternity; * going out from the Father to create the World; and lastly condescending to become Man: *Son*, in all these respects, but primarily and chiefly in respect of the first. From the whole, we may remark, that an explicite Profession of *eternal Generation* might have been dispens'd with; provided only that the eternal Existence of the Λόγος, as a *real subsisting Person, in, and of the Father*, (which comes to the same Thing) might be secured. This was the point; and this was all. In this, all sound Catholicks agreed; and to dispute it, was accounted *Heresy*, and *Blasphemy*. If any one, disliking the Name, or the Phrase of *eternal Generation*, thinks it better to assert an *eternal Word*, instead of an *eternal Son*, (meaning thereby a distinct Person, and *consubstantial* with God, whose *Word* He is) and refers the *Generation* to his first and second *Manifestation*, at the *Creation* and *Incarnation*; there seems to be no farther harm in it, than what lies in the Words, and their liableness to be misconstrued,

* *This is well express'd by the* Antiochian *Fathers, against* Paul *of* Samosata; *and by* Clement *of* Alexandria. Τοῦτον πιστεύομεν σὺν τῷ πατρὶ ἀεὶ ὄντα, ἐκπεπληρωκέναι τὸ πατρικὸν βέλημα, ὡς τὸν κόσμον ὅλον. Labb. Conc. Tom. 1. p. 845 Τέκνον αὐτὸ γνήσιον, καὶ κληρονόμον, ὥσπερ ἐπί τινα ξενιτείαν σπεῦδα πεμπόμενον, ὑπὸ μεγάλης οἰκονομίας, καὶ ἀναλογίας τοῦ πατρὸς, δι' οὗ καὶ τὰ φανερὰ καὶ τὰ ἀφανῆ τοῦ κόσμου δεδημιούργηται. Clem. Alex. Quis div. p. 955. Ox.

or to give Offence. Here therefore every Man is left to his own Diſcretion and Prudence: Only the ſafer way ſeems to be, to follow the moſt general and moſt approved manner of Expreſſion, together with the antient Faith; being, in all probability, the ſureſt means to preſerve Both. I deſignedly ſaid, firſt *and* laſt, not firſt *or* laſt. For, ſuch as interpret the *Generation*, of the *laſt* only, ſtand, I think, * clearly condemned by Scripture; many places whereof can never fairly be accounted for by the *miraculous* Conception ſolely: Beſides that from *Barnabas* and *Clemens Romanus*, down to the *Council* of *Nice*, all the Chriſtian Writers ſpeak unanimouſly of a higher, antecedent *Sonſhip*; and, generally, even found *Worſhip* upon it.

I ſhall juſt obſerve to you, in the cloſe of this Article, that, from what hath been ſaid, you may know what Judgment to make of an Aſſertion of † Dr. *Clarke*'s, viz. *That the learned'ſt of the moſt Orthodox Fathers, who aſſerted the* eternal Generation of the Son, *did yet nevertheleſs aſſert it to be an Act of the Father's eternal* Power *and* Will. By which the Doctor ſeems to inſinuate, that the good Fathers

* Sane in iſta ex Maria Virgine nativitate Suprema & Singularis ἐξοχὴ atque excellentia Filiationis Domini noſtri adeo non conſiſtit, ut ea ipſa Nativitas ad ejus ſtupendam συγκατάβασιν omnino referenda ſit. Hoc nos ſatis apertè docent, ſi modo a Spiritu Sancto edoceri velimus, multis in locis, S. literæ. ——— Ita ſemper credidit inde ab ipſis Apoſtolis Catholica Chriſti Eccleſia. *Bull.* J. p. 39.

† Script. Doctr. p. 280.

did

did not underſtand *Eternal* in the ſtrict Senſe. If the learned Doctor can ſhow, that Thoſe, who maintain'd only the *Voluntary* and *Temporary* Proceſſion of the Son, believed that the Λόγος was *eternally* pre-exiſting in the Father, by an *Act* of his Will; or that Thoſe who expreſly aſſerted an *eternal* Generation, believed alſo that it was an *Arbitrary* Thing, and might have been otherwiſe, (which I ſuppoſe is the Doctor's Senſe of an *Act of the Will*) then He will do ſomething. But, as none of his Authorities prove any thing like it; it would have been a prudent part, at leaſt, not to have produced Them to ſo little purpoſe. But enough of this Matter: I have, I hope, ſufficiently *explain'd* my Self upon this Head; and have therefore the more reaſon to expect a *diſtinct Anſwer* from You, whenever you think proper to re-conſider this Subject.

Query IX.

Whether the divine Attributes, Omniscience, Ubiquity, &c. Those individual Attributes, can be communicated without the divine Essence, from which they are inseparable?

THE intent of this Query was to prevent Equivocations; and to make the Next clearer. You agree with me that the *individual* divine Attributes cannot be communicated without the *individual* Nature in which they subsist. You add, that Dr. *Clarke*, *in the* 230th *page of his Replies, hath plainly shown*, that individual Attributes, *divine or not divine, cannot possibly be communicated at all.* Well then; we know what the Doctor means by *all divine Powers*, in his Scripture Doctrine, (*p.* 298.) which is one point gain'd: For when words are stripp'd of their Ambiguity, we may be the better able to deal with them. As to the Doctor's Aphorism laid down (*p.* 230.) I may have leave to doubt of it; notwithstanding that it is set forth to us, with the utmost Assurance. It is not unusual with the Doctor to lay down Maxims, in relation to this Controversy, which Himself would not allow, at another Time, or in another Subject. For Instance; * *necessary Agents are no Causes*,

* *Whatever proceeds from any Being, otherwise than by the* Will *of that Being, doth not* in Truth *proceed from* that Being; *but from some* other Cause *or* Necessity *extrinsick and independent of* that

that is, they do not so properly Act, as are acted upon. This is very true of all *finite* necessary Agents; for, all their necessary, or *natural* Acts, proceed not so properly from Them, as from God the Author of their Natures. But does it therefore follow that, if God acts *by a Necessity of Nature*, in some Instances, *He* is therein *acted upon* likewise? Or that all the Acts of the divine Nature are *Voluntary*, and *Free*; none *natural* and *necessary*? This should not be said by one who, *elsewhere*, speaks so much of God's being infinitely *wise*, and infinitely *good*, infinitely *happy*, &c. by an *absolute necessity of Nature*; unless He could be certain that *knowing*, *loving*, *contemplating*, and *enjoying* Himself, do not imply perpetual *Acting*; or that an infinitely *active* Being can ever cease to *Act*. I shall not scruple to assert, that by the same *absolute necessity of Nature* that the Father *exists*, He exists as a *Father*; and *Co-exists* with his *Co-essential* Son proceeding from Him. If you say, this supposes the Son *Self-existent*, or *Un-originate*; I desire it may not be *said* only, but *proved*. * In the Interim, I take leave to suppose that *Unbegotten*, and *Begotten*; *Un-originate*, and *Proceeding*, are different Ideas.

that Being. Necessary Agents *are* no Causes, *but always* Instruments *only in the hand of some other Power.* Reply, pag. 227. Compare p. 113.

* Οὔτε δύο ἀγέννητοι, οὔτε δύο μονογενεῖς· ἀλλ' εἷς ἐστι πατὴρ ἀγέννητος (ἀγέννητος γὰρ ἐστι ὁ πατὴρ μὴ ἔχων) καὶ εἷς ἐστι Υἱὸς, ἀϊδίως ὢν παρὰ πατρὸς γεγεννημένος. Cyril. Catech. 10. p. 141. Ox.

Again (*p.* 228.) *He finds fault with *the Author of ſome Conſiderations*, for ſuppoſing that *the Son is ſomething more than a meer Name, and yet not a real diſtinct Being:* And upon this lays down another *Aphoriſm*; that there is no *Medium* between *a Being*, and *not a Being:* which indeed is a very true one, if *Being*, and *Being*, are taken in the ſame Senſe; but not otherwiſe. For let me mention almoſt a parallel Caſe. Upon the Doctor's *Hypotheſis*, that God's *Subſtance* is *extended* every where; and that the ſame is the *Subſtratum* of *Space*; we may imagine two *Subſtrata*, one pervading the Sun, and the other the Moon, which are both diſtinct, and diſtant. Will you pleaſe to tell us, whether theſe two are *real diſtinct Beings*, or no? If They are, you may leave it to others to prove them *intelligent* Beings, that is, *Perſons:* And, perhaps, the very next conſequence will make them two Gods, upon the Doctor's own Principles: If they are not *real diſtinct Beings*; then here is ſomething admitted *between a Being, and not a Being*; contrary to the Doctor's Maxim: unleſs He makes them *Nothing*; and ſuppoſes two Spaces, without any *Subſtratum* at all; two *Extenſions*, without any thing *extended*.

But let us conſider, whether ſomething may not be thought on, to help both the learned

* *To avoid this Conſequence, He is forced to ſuppoſe* (pag. 29.) *that the Son is ſomething more than a* mere Name, *and yet not a* real diſtinct Being; *that is to ſay, that He is ſomething between* a Being, *and* not a Being. *Cl. Reply*, p. 228.

Doctor

Doctor and Us out of theſe Difficulties. The Truth of this Matter, ſo far as I apprehend, is, that *Being* may ſignify, either, ſimply, what *Exiſts*; or what exiſts *Separately*. This Diſtinction ſeems to be juſt, and neceſſary; and ſuch as you'l the more readily come into, having occaſion for it, as well as we. I hope, none are ſo weak, as to deny the *Perſons* to exiſt in *reality*. The very School-Men Themſelves never ſcruple to call Them *Tres Res*, *Tres entes*, or the like, in that Senſe; tho', at the ſame time, in the other Senſe of *Being*, They are all but one Being, *una ſumma res*, and *una res numero*; which comes much to the ſame with *Tertullian*'s *una* (indiviſa) *Subſtantia in Tribus cohærentibus*; (only ſetting aſide his particular manner of Explication) and is the Senſe of all Antiquity. Upon the Foot of this Diſtinction, you may readily apprehend thoſe Words of *Gregory Nazianzen*, ſpoken of the three Perſons. Ζωὰς ἡ Ζωὴ, Φῶτα ἡ Φῶς, ἀγαθὰ ἡ ἀγαθὸν, δόξας ἡ δόξαν --- Θεὸν ἕκαστον, ἂν θεωρῆται μόνον, ἢ νῷ χωρίζοιτος τὰ ἀχώριστα *. By the ſame Diſtinction, you may, probably, underſtand a very noted *Creed*; which ſeems to have coſt the learned Doctor ſome Pains in explaining. To return to our Inſtance of the Two *Subſtrata*. I ſuppoſe the Doctor, or your ſelf, will be content to allow, that This is *Subſtance*, and That *Subſtance*; and yet not *Subſtances*, but one Subſtance. In like manner alſo, This

* Orat. 13. p. 211. Pariſ. Ed.

is *Being*, and That *Being*; and yet not Two Beings, but one Being: This Eternal, and That Eternal; and yet not Two Eternals, but One Eternal. I might go on almoſt the length of an *Athanaſian* Creed. This muſt be your manner of ſpeaking, if you come to Particulars; and that becauſe the *Subſtrata* are ſuppoſed to have no ſeparate Exiſtence independent on each other, but to be united by ſome common Ligaments, which perhaps you'l call *perſonal* Attributes. And why then ſhould you be ſevere upon Us, for uſing the like Language, and upon better Reaſons? We believe the Three Perſons to have no ſeparate Exiſtence independent on each other; we ſuppoſe Them more united, in ſome reſpects, than the *Subſtrata* are ſuppos'd in your Scheme; becauſe equally preſent every where: We admit ſome common Ties or Bands of Union, which we call *eſſential* Attributes and Perfections. Either therefore allow us Our way of ſpeaking; which we think decent and proper; ſuitable to the Idea we have, and to the Circumſtances of the Caſe; founded in the very Nature and Reaſon of Things: Or elſe, find out a better for your Own; that we may, at length, learn from you, how we ought to ſpeak in this Matter.

You will ſay, it may be, that the Inſtance I have choſen, is not exactly parallel in every Circumſtance. No; God forbid it ſhould. But it agrees ſo far as is ſufficient for my purpoſe. There is this manifeſt difference, that

you

you ſuppoſe the ſeveral *Subſtrata* ſo many *parts* of God; tho' every one of Them infinitely Wiſe, infinitely Good, infinitely Powerful, infinitely every Thing, but *extended*. We, more conſiſtently, ſuppoſe Three Perſons *equal*, in all reſpects; none of them *ſingly* part of God; but every one perfect God.

A ſecond Difference is, that you ſuppoſe all the *finite* Parts, making one *Infinite*, to be one Being, one God, and one *Perſon*; by *Continuity*, I preſume, and a *perſonal* Union of the *Parts*. We ſuppoſe Three Perſons to be One God, by their *inſeparability* and the *eſſential* Union of the *Perſons:* Which, I humbly conceive, we are as able to explain, as you are to explain the other; and I hope, more able to prove it.

A third Difference permit me to mention, that you ſuffer your Imaginations to wander, where you can find no Footing; we are content to *underſtand* only, and that imperfectly, without *imagining* at all.

In fine, you have philoſophiz'd ſo far, in Theſe high and deep Matters, that you ſeem to want all the ſame favourable Allowances, which we are *thought* to do. *Others* may object ſeveral Things to us, which would bear equally hard upon us Both. The *ſimplicity* of the divine Nature, for Inſtance, is one of the ſtrongeſt and moſt popular Objections: But the learned Doctor has broke through it; and has contrived a Solution, a very good one, both for Himſelf and

and Us*. I have often thought no Hands so proper to be employed against the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, as Those which are good only at pulling down, and not at building up. If once you come to settling and determining Points of a *mysterious* Nature; there will be as fair a Plea for *This* also: And I doubt not but the same Thread of Reasoning, which first brought you to question it, will, when carefully pursued, and as soon as you perceive the like Difficulties almost in every thing, bring you to make less Scruple of it. But lest *others* should imagine, from what hath been said, that They may have some Advantage over us; let me add these few Considerations farther.

1. That what hath been urged, is not purely arguing *ad Hominem*; but it is appealing to what good Sense and impartial Reason dictates equally to You, or Us; on such, or such Suppositions.

2. That if we come to reason minutely on any other Matter, alike incomprehensible as This of the Holy Trinity, we may soon lose our selves in inextricable Mazes.

3. That if They please to take any other *Hypothesis* of the *Omnipresence*, They may meet with Difficulties there also, perhaps not inferior to the former.

4. That if They chuse to rest in *generals*, without any *Hypothesis* at all, and without descending to the *Modus*, and *Minutiæ* of it;

* *Answer to the Sixth Letter*, p. 39, 40.

This

This is the very Thing which we deſire, and contend for, in regard to the Bleſſed Trinity (which ought certainly to be *equally* dealt with) and then we may ſoon come to a good Agreement.

By purſuing this Point, I had almoſt neglected the learned Doctor's Third Aphoriſm: *That nothing Individual can be communicated.* Here is as great a Fallacy and Ambiguity in the word *Individual*, as before in the word *Being*. I ſhall make This plain to you. That particular Subſtance, which is ſuppoſed to *pervade*, and to be *commenſurate* to the Sun, is an *individual* Being, in ſome Senſe; unleſs there be a *Medium* between *a Being* and *not a Being*, which the learned Doctor admits not: The whole Subſtance likewiſe is one *individual* Being, and *Perſon* too; upon the Doctor's *Hypotheſis*: And we ſay farther, that three Perſons may be one *individual* Being; having, we think, a very good meaning in it. So here are plainly three Senſes of the word *Individual*; and till you can fix a certain *principle of Individuation*, (a Thing much wanted, and by which you might oblige the learned World) any one of theſe Senſes appears as juſt and reaſonable as another. Now, the Doctor's Maxim, rightly underſtood, may be true, in all theſe Senſes. For, in reſpect of the *Firſt*, what is peculiar and *proper* to one Part, is not *communicated*, or *common* to other Parts: In reſpect of the *Second*, what is *proper* to one *Perſon*,

ſon, is not *common* to other *Perſons:* And ſo, in reſpect of the *Third*, what is *proper* to one *Eſſence* or *Subſtance*, is not *common* to other *Eſſences* or *Subſtances*. All this is very true: but to what purpoſe is it, or whom does the learned Doctor contradict? This is only telling us, that *ſo far*, or in *ſuch reſpect*, as any thing is ſuppoſed *individual* or *incommunicable*, it is ſuppoſed *individual* or *incommunicable*; which no Body doubts of. But whether This, or That be communicable, or how far, or in what manner (which is all the difficulty) remains a Queſtion as much as ever; and the Doctor's *Maxim* will not help us at all in it. It may be the ſafeſt way, firſt to try the ſtrength and the uſe of it upon the Doctor's own *Hypotheſis*. Let it be ask'd, whether the Wiſdom, *&c.* reſiding in that Part which pervades the Sun (for it ſeems that it muſt be *intelligent*, and *infinitely* ſo; unleſs one infinite Intelligent be made up of *Unintelligents*, or *finite Intelligents*) I ſay, let it be ask'd, whether that be the very *individual* Wiſdom which reſides in another Part, at any given Diſtance. I preſume, to this Queſtion, you muſt anſwer, *Yes:* And then we are to obſerve, that here is but one *individual* infinite Wiſdom, which is *entirely* in the *whole*, and *entirely* in every *part*; *proper*, in ſome Senſe, to each *ſingle* Part (ſince it can have only ſuch Attributes as *inhere* in it) and yet *common* to All; *Diffuſed* through extended Subſtance, yet not

Co-

Co-extended: Nor *multiplied*, becauſe but *One*. If you admit thus far, as I think you muſt, we ſhall have nothing to apprehend, in point of *Reaſon* (which nevertheleſs is what you chiefly truſt to) againſt the Doctrine of the Trinity. The *Communication* of *Eſſential* Attributes, which we ſpeak of, is, at leaſt, as Intelligible as what I have been mentioning; and every whit as conſiſtent with the Doctor's *Maxim*, that nothing which is *Individual* can be *Communicated*. Only You have *your* Senſe of *Individual*, and We have *our's*; and You can account no better for ſo many, and infinitely diſtant Parts making *one Perſon*, than We for three Perſons making *one Subſtance*, or one God. Let us therefore be content to ſtop where it becomes us; and frankly confeſs our Ignorance of theſe Things. For, by pretending farther, we ſhall not diſcover leſs Ignorance than before, but much greater Vanity. I would not have preſumed to diſcourſe thus freely of the tremendous Subſtance of the eternal God (infinitely ſurpaſſing Human Comprehenſion) were it not, in a manner, neceſſary, in order to expoſe the Folly, and the Preſumption of doing it. If the Doctrine of the Bleſſed Trinity is to ſtand or fall by this kind of reaſoning, it was very proper to make ſome Trial of it firſt, where it might be done more ſafely, to ſee how it would anſwer. You, I preſume, cannot complain of me, for treating you in your own way; and turning upon you your own Artillery. But

to

to proceed; You are positive in it, *that the Son of God hath not the individual Attributes of God the Father*; *for then*, say you, *He must be the Father*. On the contrary, I affirm that He hath the *individual* Attributes of God the Father, as much as He has the *individual* Essence: For, otherwise He must be a *Creature* only: And therefore the Question between you and me, in plain Terms, is, whether the Son be *God*, or a *Creature*.

QUERY X.

Whether if They (the Attributes belonging to the Son) *be not* individually *the same, they can be any thing more than faint Resemblances of them, differing from them as* Finite *from* Infinite; *and then in what Sense, or with what Truth, can the Doctor pretend that* * all divine Powers, except absolute Supremacy and Independency, *are communicated to the Son? And whether every Being, besides the one supreme Being, must not necessarily be a* Creature, *and* finite; *and whether* all divine Powers *can be communicated to a Creature*, infinite *Perfection to a* finite *Being?*

I Have put under One Query, what before made Two, because the Substance of Them is nearly the same; and contains but one Argument. I have two Things upon my Hands at once;

* *Script. Doctr.* p. 298.

once; firſt to clear and fix your Senſe, which is induſtriouſly diſguiſed; and next to confute it. The preſent Query relates chiefly to the former, to draw you out of general and ambiguous Terms, that ſo we may come up the cloſer, and fall directly to the point in Queſtion. You tell me, in anſwer to the former part, that the divine *Attributes of the Son are not* individually *the ſame with thoſe of the Father* *. By which you mean that they are not *Divine:* And ſo here you have diſcovered, that the Doctor does not underſtand *Divine*, as others do in this Controverſy; and as a candid and ingenuous Reader might be apt to underſtand Him. You add, that *They* (the Attributes of the Son) *are*, notwithſtanding, *more than faint Reſemblances*; *the Son being the Brightneſs of his Father's Glory, and the expreſs Image of his Perſon.* I allow that this Text does ſet forth a great deal more than a *faint Reſemblance:* But you have not ſhown that your *Hypotheſis* ſuppoſes ſo much; and therefore the quoting of this Text is only arguing againſt your ſelf. The Inference we draw from this Text, conſonant to all Antiquity, is, that the Reſemblance between Father and Son is compleat and perfect; and that therefore They do not differ as *Finite* and *Infinite*, ſince that Suppoſition would ſet Them at an *Infinite* diſtance from any ſuch perfect and compleat Reſemblance. You obſerve farther, that there

* Pag. 54.

can

can be but one *Intelligent Being* (the ſame, with you, as *Perſon*) *abſolutely infinite in all reſpects*, (*p.* 55.) which, tho' an Aſſertion of great Importance, you are pleas'd barely to lay down, without the leaſt tittle of Proof, or ſo much as pretence to it. Nay, you admit in your * Notes, that there may be *two Infinite* Beings, in the Senſe of *immenſe*; that is, two Beings *omnipreſent*, or *infinitely extended*. And why not as well Two Perſons infinitely perfect in all other reſpects, as well as *preſence?* For to uſe your own way of arguing, in that very Place: If *finite* Power, Wiſdom, Goodneſs, *&c.* do not exclude *Infinite*; it is plain that *infinite* Power, Wiſdom, Goodneſs, *&c.* of One, do not exclude the *infinite* Power, Wiſdom, Goodneſs, *&c.* of Another. Beſides that Two, Infinite in All reſpects, are as eaſily conceived, as Two, Infinite in Any: And therefore, here you ſeem, by your too liberal Conceſſions, to have unſaid what you had ſaid before; and to have unravell'd your own Objection. You are aware that an Adverſary may take advantage of what you ſay; and endeavor, lamely, to prevent it, by telling us (*p.* 56.) that, tho' it be poſſible

* One Infinite, *in the Senſe of* immenſe, *does not (by taking up all Space) exclude (neceſſarily) an other Immenſe, any more than it excludes any* Finite. *For if a* finite *Being doth not exclude (God) from a* finite *Place, it is plain that an* Infinite, *that is, an* immenſe Being *cannot exclude Him from* Infinite, *that is, from* immenſe *Place. So that perhaps it is no ſuch abſolute* impoſſibility, *as ſome have thought it, to ſuppoſe* two diſtinct *immenſe Beings.* Not. p. 56.

to

to ſuppoſe two *diſtinct* immenſe Beings, yet it is impoſſible there ſhould be two immenſe Beings of the *ſame individual Nature*; for ſo, They muſt *coincide, and be but one Perſon.* But what if thoſe who aſſert *the ſame individual Nature*, in more Perſons than one, underſtand the Words in a larger Senſe than you here take Them in? It is very certain, they do not underſtand the Phraſe of *the ſame individual Nature*, as You, who make it equivalent to *the ſame Perſon*, underſtand it: For, they aſſert more Perſons than one to have *the ſame individual Nature.* In the mean while, what a wonderful diſcovery is this, which you have laid ſuch a ſtreſs on; that *two Perſons* cannot be *one Perſon*, without *coinciding* and making *one Perſon.* This is all that you have really ſaid; and very true it is; only I am at a loſs to find out the pertinency of it. To conclude this Head: As to *Infinite* in the Senſe of *Extenſion*, (into Length, Breadth and Highth) you will give me leave to ſuſpend my Judgment. I do not find, either that it is aſſerted in Scripture, or generally maintain'd by the Fathers; but that it is liable to many Difficulties, in point of Reaſon, more than I am, at preſent, able to anſwer. See what a * late thoughtful Writer has ſaid, and what † *Cudworth* had before Collect-

* *Impartial Inquiry into the Exiſtence and Nature of God, by* S. C. Part 2. C. 1, 2, 3.

† *Intellectual Syſt.* pag. 818. *to* p. 834.

ed on that Subject. In my Humble Opinion, ſuch intricate Queſtions are too high for Us; and are what our Faculties were not made for. However that be, You and I need not differ. For, if You can admit the poſſibility of *Two infinite extended Beings*, You can have nothing conſiderable to object againſt the *one Infinity* of Three infinite Perſons, which I aſſert, and without determining the *modus* of it.

You proceed to obſerve, that the *Son's Office and Character doth not require infinite Powers:* To which I ſhall only ſay, that it may, for any thing you know; ſo that this is only gueſſing in the Dark. Laſt of all, you come to interpret Dr. *Clarke*; ſuppoſing Him to mean by *Divine Powers*, * all divine Powers *relating to the Son's Character.* If He meant ſo, He might eaſily have ſaid ſo: And yet if He had, He had ſtill left us in uncertainties as much as ever; to muſe upon a Diſtinction, which He has no ground for; and which, when admitted, will make no Man wiſer. You *hope*, *the Queriſt is ſo good a Philoſopher as to perceive*, (*tho' He doth not conſider it*) *that abſolute infinite Perfections include and infer* Supremacy *and* Independency. *And therefore*, *when Dr.* Clarke *excepted Supremacy and Independency*, *He plainly*, *in Reaſon and Conſequence*, *excepted abſolute infinite Powers.*

* *Script. Doctr.* p. 298.

Now

Now, I am perſwaded, that Dr. *Clarke* would have thought it hard meaſure to have been charged, by his Adverſaries, with this ſo *plain Conſequence*, which you here ſo freely lay upon Him. The *Queriſt* was aware that the Doctor's words might bear an orthodox Senſe; namely, that to the Son are communicated all things belonging to the Father, excepting only what is *Perſonal*; that is, excepting that He is not the *firſt in Order*; not *Supreme*, in that Senſe, nor *Un-originate*. The Doctor well knew that His words might bear this Conſtruction; and perhaps would not have took it well of any, but a Friend, that ſhould have tied down a *looſe* and *general* Expreſſion to a *ſtrict particular* Meaning; and then have loaded it with Conſequences too ſhocking to be admitted in plain and expreſs Terms. But to proceed: You ſeem to be much offended at the Queriſt, for asking, *Whether all divine Powers can be communicated to a Creature, infinite Perfection to a finite Being?* This, you ſay, is *an evident Contradiction, which ought not to have been put by one Scholar upon Another.* But, after this Rebuke, will you pleaſe to hearken to the reaſon of the Caſe. The difficulty, you know, with the *Queriſt*, was, how to come at the Doctor's real Senſe, couch'd under general and ambiguous Expreſſions; that ſo the Controverſy might be brought to a Point; and it might be ſeen plainly what was the true ſtate of the Queſtion: Which, as appears now,

is only this: whether God the Son be a *Creature* or no. The Doctor talk'd of the Son's having *divine* Powers, and *all* divine Powers. It was very proper to ask you, whether He hereby meant *infinite* Powers or no; and withal to ſhow, if you ſhould not anſwer directly, that He could not mean it, *conſiſtently* with the *Arian* Hypotheſis, which He ſeem'd, in other parts of his Performance, to eſpouſe. You will not yet ſay directly, that the Son's Perfections are *finite*, nor deny them to be *infinite:* So hard a thing it is to draw you out of your ambiguous Terms; or to make you ſpeak plainly what you mean. All you are pleas'd to ſay, is, that the Powers or Perfections of the Son are not *abſolutely* infinite: As if *infinity* were of two Sorts, *abſolute* and *limited*; or might be rightly divided into *Infinity*, and *not Infinity*. Inſtead of this, I could wiſh, that words may be uſed in their true and proper meaning. If you do not think the Perfections of the Son are *infinite*, and yet are unwilling to limit them; let them be called *indefinite*, which is the proper word to expreſs your meaning; and then every Reader may be able to underſtand us, and may ſee where we differ. We are now Both agreed, that the Doctor, by *divine* Powers, did not mean *infinite* Powers. Now let us proceed to the next Query.

QUERY XI.

Whether if the Doctor means by divine *Powers, Powers given by God (in the same Sense as Angelical Powers are* divine *Powers) only in a higher degree than are given to other Beings; it be not equivocating, and saying nothing: nothing that can come up to the Sense of those Texts before cited, * or to these following?*

Applied to the one God.	To God the Son.
Thou, even Thou, art Lord alone; Thou hast made Heaven, the Heaven of Heavens with all their Host, the Earth and all Things that are therein, &c. Neh. 9. 6.	*All Things were made by Him,* Joh. 1. 3. *By Him were all Things created; He is before all Things, and by Him all Things consist,* Colos. 1. 16, 17.
In the Beginning, God created the Heavens and the Earth, Gen. 1. 1.	*Thou, Lord, in the Beginning, hast laid the Foundation of the Earth; and the Heavens are the work of thy Hands,* Heb. 1. 10.

IF the Doctor means, by *divine* Powers, no more than is intimated in this Query, I must blame Him first for equivocating and playing with an ambiguous Word; and next for restraining and limiting the Powers of the Son of God;

* Qu. 6. p. 89.

not only *without*, but *againſt* Scripture; and conſequently for giving us, not the *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, but his *own*. That there is no ground, from the Texts themſelves, for any ſuch Limitation as is now ſuppoſed, is tacitely implied in the Doctor's own Confeſſion; that the Son is excluded from nothing but *abſolute Supremacy* and *Independency: So naturally does Truth ſometimes prevail, by its own native Clearneſs and Evidence, againſt the ſtrongeſt and moſt ſettled Prejudices*. Indeed, the thing is very clear from the Texts themſelves cited above; eſpecially when ſtrengthened with Thoſe now produced under this Query. That the Son was, and is endowed with *creative Powers*, is plain from theſe Texts, and others which might be added; and is confirmed by the unanimous Suffrage of Catholick Antiquity. And that the Title of *Creator* is the diſtinguiſhing Character of the one Supreme God, is ſo clear from * Scripture, that He who runs may read it. Now let us conſider what you have to except, in order to elude the force of this Argument.

The Son of God, you ſay, *is manifeſtly the Father's Agent in the Creation of the Univerſe*; referring to *Epheſ.* 3. 9. and to *Heb.* 1. 2. from whence you infer, that He is *ſubordinate in Nature and Powers to Him.* This you have (*p.* 58.) and in your Notes (*p.* 55.) you

* Nehem. 9. 6. Iſa. 40. 12, 13. — 18, 19, 20, 21, *&c.* Iſa. 42. 5. 8. Iſa. 43. 1. 10. Jer. 10. 10. 11, 12.

inſiſt

insist much upon the Distinction between δι' αὐτοῦ, and ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, explaining the former of an *instrumental*, and the latter of an *efficient* Cause; of which more in due time and place. As to the Son's being *Agent with*, or *Assistant to* the Father, in the work of Creation, we readily admit it; and even contend for it. The Father is *primarily*, and the Son *secondarily*, or *immediately*, Author of the World; which is so far from proving that He is *inferior*, in *Nature* or *Powers*, to the Father; that it is rather a convincing Argument that He is *equal* in Both. A *Subordination* of *Order*, but none of *Nature*, is thereby intimated. * *Eusebius*, whom you quote (*p.* 55.) out of Dr. *Clarke*, and † misstranslate to serve your purpose, does not deny the proper *Efficiency* of the Son in the Work of Creation. All He asserts is, that the Creation is *primarily* and *eminently* attributed to the Father, because of his Αὐθεντία, his *Prerogative*, *Authority*, *Supremacy*, as Father, or first Person; not denying the Son's *proper Efficiency*, but only (if I may so call it) ‡ *original*

* *See* Euseb. Contr. Marcel. l. 1. c. 20. p. 84.

† *The learned Doctor, and after Him, You construe* ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, *and* δι' αὐτοῦ, *by* efficient, *and* ministring *Cause. As if a* ministring *Cause might not be* efficient, *or must necessarily be* opposed *to it.*

‡ *This is excellently illustrated by the elder* Cyrill. Πατρὸς βουληθέντος τὰ πάντα καλῶς κατασκευάζειν, τῷ μὲν πατρὸς νεύματι ὁ Υἱὸς τὰ πάντα ἐδημιούργησεν· ἵνα τὸ μὲν νεῦμα τηρῇ τοῦ πατρὸς τὴν αὐθεντικὴν ἐξουσίαν, καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς δὲ πάλιν ἔχῃ ἐξουσίαν τῶν ἰδίων δημιουργημάτων· καὶ μήτε πατὴρ ἀπαλλοτριωθῇ τῆς δεσποτείας τῶν ἰδίων δημιουργημάτων, μήτε ὁ Υἱὸς τῶν ὑπ' ἄλλου δημιουργημάτων βασιλεύῃ, ἀλλὰ τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. Catech. 11. p. 146. Ed. Oxon.

Efficiency; that is, making Him the *second* and not the *first* Person; not *Father* but *Son*. Indeed, the * general Opinion of the Antients center'd in this; that the Father, as Supreme, issued out Orders for the Creation of the Universe, and the Son executed them. And this was asserted, not only by the *Ante-Nicene* Writers, but † *Post-Nicene* too; and such as strenuously defended the *Catholick* Faith against the *Arians*. I have before observed that the Antients had a very good meaning and intent in assigning (as it were) to the Three Persons, their several Parts or Provinces in the Work of Creation: And let no Man be offended, if, in this way of considering it, the Son be sometimes said ὑπηρετεῖν, or ὑπουργεῖν, or the like. This need not be thought any greater disparagement to the Dignity of the Son, than it is, on the other hand, a disparagement to the Dignity of the Father to be represented as having the Counsel and Assistance of two other Persons; or as leaving every Thing to be wisely order'd, regulated, and perfected by the Son and Holy Spirit. These Things are not to be strictly and rigorously interpreted according to the Letter; but οἰκονομικῶς, and θεοπρεπῶς. The design of all was: 1. To keep up a more lively Sense of a real Distinction of Persons. 2. To teach us the indivisible Unity and Co-essentiality

* *See* Irenæus, p. 85. Tertullian, Contr. Prax. c. 12. Hippolyt. Contr. Noet. c. 14.

† *See* Petavius de Trin. l. 2. c. 7. Bull. D. F. p. 80. 111.

of

of all Three, as of one * Creator. 3. To ſignify wherein that Unity conſiſts, or into what it ultimately reſolves, *viz.* into *Unity of Principle*, one Ἀρχὴ, Head, Root, Fountain of all. As to the Diſtinction between δι' αὐτοῦ, and ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, *per quem* and *ex quo*, or the like; it can be of very little ſervice to your Cauſe. The prepoſition ἀπὸ, with a genitive after it, is frequently uſed, as well in Scripture as in Eccleſiaſtical Writers, to expreſs the *efficient* Cauſe, as much as ὑπὸ, or ἐκ, or ὡς, or any other. So that the Argument drawn from the uſe of the Prepoſitions is very poor and trifling, as was long ſince obſerved by † *Baſil* the Great, who very handſomly expoſes it's Author and Inventor, *Aetius*, for it. Pleaſe but to account clearly for one Text, out of many, (*Rom.* 11. 36.) *Of Him, and through* Him (δι' ὠυτοῦ) *and to Him are all Things; to whom be Glory for ever.* If you underſtand this of the *Father*; then, by your Argument from the Phraſe, δι' ὠυτοῦ, you make Him alſo no more than an *inſtrumental* Cauſe: If you underſtand it of more Perſons, Here's an illuſtrious Proof of a Trinity in Unity. If it be pretended, which is the ‡ Doctor's laſt reſort, that although the uſe of thoſe Prepoſitions ſingly be not ſufficient, yet when they are uſed *in expreſs Contra-*

* *So* Origen, *who makes the Father* δημιεργὸς, *and the Son* δημιεργὸς, Contr. Celſ. p. 317. *yet, in the very ſame Treatiſe, denies that the World could have more* Creators *than one.* Μὴ δυναμένε ὑπὸ πολλῶν δημιεργῶν γεγονέναι, p. 18.

† De Spir. Sanct. p. 145, *&c.*

‡ *See* Script. Doctr. p. 90.

diſtin-

distinction to each other, they are of more Significancy; I answer first, that I desire to know of what Significancy they are in *Rom.* 11. 36. where they seem to be used in *express Contra-distinction* to each other; and secondly, admitting that they are of *Significancy*, they may signify only a *real* Distinction of Persons, as St. **Basil* well observes; or some *priority* of *order* proper to the *first Person:* This is all the use which any Catholick Writer ever pretended to make of the Distinction. However, to countenance the Distinction between the Father as the *efficient*, and the Son as the *instrumental* Cause, you are pleased to say farther (*p.* 56.) *'tis remarkable that* (*according to the Sense of the foregoing Distinction*) *though Christ is frequently stiled by the Antients* Τεχνίτης *and* Δημιουργὸς, *yet* Ποιητὴς τ̃ ὅλων *is* (*to the best of my Remembrance*) *always confined by Them to the Father only* †.

Had your Remark been true and just, yet it would not be easy to show that τεχνίτης, or however δημιουργὸς, may not signify as much as ποιητής. But your *Memory* has much deceived you, in this Matter; and you should be cautious how you make your Readers rely upon it.

* De Spir. Sanct. p. 148.

† *See* Origen Contr. Cels. p. 317. *where the Son is said* ποιῆσαι τ̃ κόσμον, *and the Father to be* πρώτως, *that is,* primarily *or* eminently δημιουργός. *If* ποιητὴς *signified more than* δημιουργὸς, Origen *spoke very unaccurately.*

Cyrill *of* Alexandria *supposes God the Father to have been in reality* τεχνίτης *from everlasting;* δημιουργὸς *in Power and Intention only.* Thesaur. ass. 4 p. 34.

Those

Thoſe Words (eſpecially the Two laſt of them) ſeem to have been uſed by the Antients promiſcuouſly; and to have been applied indifferently to Father or Son, as They had occaſion to mention either. If They are oft'ner applied to the Father, it is only becauſe He is the *firſt Perſon*; and is therefore *primarily* and *eminently*, τεχνίτης, δημιουργὸς, or ποιητὴς; not that the Son is not *ſtrictly*, *properly*, and *compleatly Creator* alſo, according to the fulleſt ſenſe and import of any, or of all thoſe Words. They were intended to ſignify that the Son is the *immediate* and *efficient* Cauſe of all Things; had * *creative* Powers; and was, with the Father, *Creator* of Men, of Angels, of the whole Univerſe. A late † Writer is pleaſed to expreſs Himſelf, upon this Head, in ſuch a manner as may deceive ignorant and unwary Readers. "I know not (*ſays He*) that "either *Arians*, or any primitive Chriſtian "Writers, ever adventured to give the Cha"racter of *great Architect of the Univerſe* "to Jeſus Chriſt; chuſing rather, with the "ſacred Writings, to ſay, in ſofter Language, "that *thro' Him* God created All, and reſerv"ing the abſolute Title of *Creator of the Uni"verſe* to Another.

If He *knows not* theſe Things, He might forbear to ſpeak of them. What He ſays, even

* *The* Arians *themſelves would ſay*, ſua virtute fecit, *meaning it of the Son. See the Citation above*, p. 94.

† *Mr.* Emlyn. *Exam. of Dr.* Bennet, p. 12. firſt Edit.

of

of the *Sacred* Writings, is *Misrepresentation:* For, They do not constantly follow that *soft* Language, which He so much approves of. They do it not, in *Joh.* 1. 3, 10. *Colos.* 1. 16. *Hebr.* 1. 10. Neither can that Construction be ascertain'd, in any one of these Texts, from any *necessary* force of the Preposition διά. As to Antiquity, which this Gentleman pretends to, He may *know*, hereafter, that the Character of [a] *great Architect of the Universe*, is expresly given to *Jesus Christ*, by *Eusebius*; who was never suspected of carrying Orthodoxy too high. A Man must be a very stranger to the *Antients*, who can make any Question whether They attributed the Work of Creation to the Son, as much as to the Father. They ascribed it equally to Both; only with this difference, as before observed, that, for the greater Majesty and Dignity of the Father as the *first Person*, They supposed Him to [b] issue out Orders, or to give his *Fiat*, for the Creation, and the Son to Execute. From hence we may easily understand in what Sense the Title of *Creator* was [c] *primarily*, or *eminently* attributed to the Father; and yet, as to any real *Power* or *Efficiency*, the Son is as truly and properly *Creator*;

a Ὁ μέγας τῶν ὅλων δημιουργὸς λόγος. Euseb. E. H. l. 10. c. 4. pag. 316.

b Τὸ μὲν πατρὸς εὐδοκοῦντος καὶ κελεύοντος, τὸ δὲ υἱοῦ, πράττοντος καὶ δημιουργοῦντος, τὸ δὲ πνεύματος τρέφοντος καὶ αὔξοντος. Iren. p. 285. Ed. Bened.

Πατὴρ ἠθέλησεν, υἱὸς ἐποίησεν, πνεῦμα ἐφανέρωσεν. Hippol. Contr. Noet. p. 16.

c Πρώτως δημιουργόν. Orig. Contr. Cels. p. 317.

and

and is frequently ſo ſtiled, by the primitive Writers, in the * fulleſt and ſtrongeſt Terms. You may ſee ſome Teſtimonies, in the Margin, from *Athenagoras*, *Tatian*, *Irenæus*, *Clement* of *Alexandria*, and *Origen*. It would be eaſy to add more, from *Hippolytus*, *Gregory* of *Neocæſarea*, *Novatian*, and indeed from the generality of the Church Writers down from *Barnabas* to the Council of *Nice*. I muſt obſerve to you, that even your admired † *Euſebius* (whom you before quoted in your favour, miſtaking Him very widely) He applies the Title of ποιητὴς τ̃ ὅλων, (the higheſt which you think the Father Himſelf can have) to the Son,

* Πρὸς αὐτοῦ τ̃ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ πάντα ἐγένετο, ἑνὸς ὄντ⊖ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τ̃ υἱοῦ. Athenag. p. 38. Ed. Oxon, *Obſerve* πρὸς αὐτοῦ, *as well as* δι' αὐτοῦ.

Αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ τὴν ὕλην δημιεργήσας. Ἀγγέλων δημιεργός. Tatian. p. 22. 26. Edit. Ox.

Τοῦτον μονογενῆ τοῦτον πάντων ποιητήν. Iren. pag. 44. Ed. Bened. Τοῦτον κόσμου ποιητὴν —— εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἐληλυθότα. Ibid. Τὸν τ̃ πάντων κτίσην, καὶ δημιουργὸν, & ποιητὴν, λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, p. 79. Τῶν ἁπάντων τεχνίτης λόγος, p. 190. Fabricator Omnium, p. 219. Fabricator Univerſorum, p. 307.

Ὦ τὰ πάντα δεδημιούργηται. Clem. Alexandr. p. 7 Edit. Oxon. Συμπάντων Θεὸν ἕνα μένειν —— δημιουργὸν ὑὸν σὺ πατρὶ. p. 142. Πάντα ὁ λόγος ποιεῖ —— τὰ ὅλα δημιουργεῖ —— τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τοῦ Ἀνθρώπε δημιουργὸς, p. 310. Ἡ τ̃ ὅλων Ἀρχὴ. p. 669. Ὁ λόγ⊖ δημιουργίας αἴτιος, p. 654. Πάντων δημιουργὸς, p. 768.

Τὸν λόγον πεποιηκέναι πάντα, ὅσα ὁ πατὴρ αὐτῷ συνετέλατο. Origen. Contr. Celſ. p. 63.

Δημιουργὸν τ̃ πάντων, κτίσην, ποιητὴν τ̃ πάντων. Origen. apud Huet. Origenian. p. 38.

N. B. *This laſt Citation, from a* Catena, *is of leſs Authority; but the Citations from his other* certainly *genuine Works, are, in Senſe, equivalent.*

† Euſeb. in Pſalm. p. 125. 564. 630. *in the firſt of the three Places, the Words are remarkably full and ſtrong.* Ὁ δημιουργὸς λόγος, ὁ ποιητὴς τ̃ ὅλων. *The other Two are equivalent in Senſe.* Ποιητὴς τ̃ ὅλων, *and* ὁ ποιητὴς αὐτῶν; *where* ὅλων *is underſtood.*

no leſs than thrice; as *Irenæus* had done, thrice alſo, before, in Words equivalent; and *Origen*, probably, once; as alſo * *Hippolytus:* not to mention that almoſt All the Fathers by interpreting, *Gen.* 1. 26. (ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον, &c.) of Father and Son jointly, have implicitely and conſequentially, tho' not expreſly, ſaid the ſame thing. To proceed:

You have an Argument to prove that *Creating* does not imply *infinite* Power. *For*, you ſay, *was the extent of thoſe Powers, then exercis'd, infinite, 'tis evident, the World muſt be infinite alſo*, (p. 58.) This, indeed, is doing the Buſineſs at once: For, if this reaſoning be juſt, the Father Himſelf, as well as the Son, is effectually excluded from ever giving any ſenſible Proof, or from exerting any Act, of *infinite* Power. St. *Paul*'s Argument from the Creation, for the *eternal Power and Godhead* of the Creator, is rendred inconcluſive: For it will be eaſy to reply, in Contradiction to the Apoſtle's reaſoning, that the Things which are made are *finite*; and therefore cannot prove the maker of Them to be *infinite:* So that Atheiſts and Unbelievers were not ſo entirely *without excuſe*, as the good Apoſtle imagin'd. If you think there is ſome difference between *infinite Power*, and *eternal Power and Godhead*; and therefore that the Apoſtle's Argument is not

* Contr. Beron. & Hel. p. 226. *Comp.* Contr. Noet. p. 16. *The genuineſs of the firſt is ſomewhat doubtful; but the laſt is not queſtion'd.*

per-

pertinent to the point in Hand; I ſhall be content if *Creating* be allowed a ſufficient Proof of the Son's *eternal Power and Godhead*; ſince it brings me directly to the Point I aim at: Beſides, that *infinite Power* will come in of Courſe afterwards, by neceſſary Inference and Implication. I had almoſt forgot to take notice of your way of wording your Argument, which looks not very fair. You ſay, *was the* extent *of thoſe Powers infinite*; as if any one ſaid it was, in the Senſe wherein you underſtand the word *extent*. For Reaſons beſt known to your ſelf, you do not diſtinguiſh between extent of Power *ad intra*, in reſpect of *Degree*; and extent of Power *ad extra*, in reſpect of the *exerciſe* of it. It may require an *infinite Degree* of Power, to *create* a grain of Sand; tho' the *extent* of that outward Act reaches no farther than the thing created. Now, you know, our diſpute is only about infinite *extent* of Power in the firſt Senſe. Let us therefore put the Argument into plain Words, and ſee how it will bear.

" Was the Power exercis'd in the Creation " *infinite in Degree*, or exceeding any *finite* " Power, *then it is evident that the World* " *muſt be infinite*. Make this out, with any tolerable Senſe or Connexion, and you'l do ſomething. Next let us put the Argument in the other Light.

" If the Power exercis'd in the Creation ex- " tended to an *infinite Compaſs*, or to an *in-*

" *finite*

" *finite* Number of Things, then *it is evident* " *that the World muſt be infinite.* Right: If the Creation had been *infinite in extent*, the Creation muſt have been *infinite in extent.* But who is it that you are diſputing againſt? Or whom do you oblige by theſe Diſcoveries? The Queſtion is, whether the *Creating*, that is, producing out of Nothing, any one *ſingle* Thing, however ſmall in extent, be not an Act *proper* to God only; exceeding any *finite* Power; incommunicable to any *Creature.* It is ſufficient for *You*, to put *Us* upon the proof of the *Affirmative:* No conſidering Man would ever attempt to prove the *Negative.* As to the *Affirmative*, there are many very probable preſumptive Proofs, ſuch as ought to have great Weight with Us: particularly, *Creation* every where in Scripture look'd on as a *divine* Act; Not ſo much as a Grain of Sand, or a Particle of Matter, ſaid to be created by an Angel, or Archangel, or any Creature whatever; Reaſonable to ſuppoſe that nothing can come into Being by any Power leſs than His, who is the Author and Fountain of all Being. To this agrees the general Senſe of the more ſober and thinking Part of Mankind. This was the Doctrine of the * *Ante-Nicene* Catholick Writers, ſo far as ap-

* Hoc Deus ab Homine differt, quoniam Deus quidem facit, Homo autem fit: & quidem Qui facit, ſemper Idem eſt. *Iren. p.* 240. *Ed. Bened.*

Nihil enim in totum Diabolus invenitur feciſſe, videlicet cum & *Ipſe Creatura* ſit Dei, quemadmodum & reliqui Angeli. *Iren. p.* 228. *See alſo* Bull. D. F. Epilog. p. 291, 292.

pears;

pears, as well as of Thoſe that came after. Wherefore the *Arians*, in aſcribing Creation to a *Creature*, innovated in the Faith of Chriſt, copied after the *Gnoſticks*, and expoſed their Cauſe. Since They reſolved to make a *Creature* only, of the Son of God, they ſhould not have allowed Him any Power of *Creating*; but ſhould have interpreted all thoſe Texts which ſpeak in favour of it, as the *Socinians* have done ſince, of a *metaphorical* Creation. That indeed had been novel, and ſtrain'd enough; but accompanied with leſs abſurdity than the other. However, This uſe we may make of what the *Arians* ſo univerſally granted; Firſt, to obſerve, that Scripture and Tradition muſt have appeared to run very ſtrong, at that time, for it: And it may farther ſhow, *how eaſy and natural that Notion muſt be allowed to be, which ſo many could not forbear expreſſing clearly and diſtinctly; even frequently when, at the ſame time, they were about to affirm, and endeavoring to prove ſomething not very conſiſtent with it.* But we ſhall have more of this Matter in the following *Queries*.

QUERY XII.

Whether the Creator of all Things was not Himself uncreated; and therefore could not be ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, *made out of nothing.*

THIS and the four following Queries, *are*, you say, *all, at most, but Arguments*, ad Ignorantiam, or Verecundiam, (p. 59.) *to put us upon determining Things, on either side, not clearly revealed.* To say the Truth, you seem here to be very much perplex'd; and therefore have reason to complain: And I am not to expect any very clear and distinct Answers. You admit (*p.* 60.) that *the Creator of all Things must be Himself uncreated.* Well then: The Son is *Creator* of all Things; Therefore He is *uncreated.* The Premises are Both your own; The Conclusion mine: And, one might think, it should be Your's too. But you are, it seems, very loth to come into it; and discover a strong Inclination to elude and evade it; if it were any way possible for you to do it. Let us see what you can say: *If the* Scripture-Sense *be the true and only proper Sense of the word*, Creature, (*to wit, the visible and invisible Worlds brought into being by the Power of the* Λόγος, *or Son of God, in Subordination to the Will and Power of the Father*) *then 'tis manifest that the* Λόγος, *who thus created Them, must* (*whatever*

ever is the nature of his own Production or Generation) *be, in this way of ſpeaking, uncreated.* This is ſomething myſterious. It is however very plain that you are ſtraining hard for ſome *odd, peculiar Senſe* of the word, *Creature*, or *Created*; which is to be *called* the *Scripture-Senſe*; and if this does not relieve you, all is loſt.

You give us the *Scripture-Doctrine* of the *Creation*; expreſſing both the *Creation* it ſelf, and the *Perſon* by whom it was *wrought:* and that *whole Doctrine*, tho' ſet forth in *many* Words, you call the *Scripture-Senſe* of that *One* Word, *Creature*, or *Created.* As if I ſhould ſay; the Scripture-Account of the *Ark* is, that it was made by *Noah*; therefore the *Scripture-Senſe* of the word, *Ark*, implies the making of it by *Noah.* Or, the Scripture-Account of the *Temple* is, that it was built by *Solomon*; therefore the Scripture Senſe of the word, *Temple*, ſuppoſes it to be ſomething made by *Solomon:* And if there were ever ſo many *Temples* beſides that one, yet They could not properly be call'd *Temples*, unleſs built by *Solomon.* This is juſt as good as your pretence, that *creating* does not ſignify ſimply, *creating*; but creating by the Λόγος. Give me leave to ask, whether the *Jews*, who kept their *Sabbath* in Memory of the *Creation*, and undoubtedly took their notion of it from *Scripture*, underſtood the word conſtantly in your Senſe, as created by the Λόγος? If they did;

That is a point I may make ſome uſe of another Time: If They did not; then the *Scripture-Senſe* of the word, *Creature*, before the coming of the *Meſſiah*, was ſomething different from what you have given us. I ſhall only add, that your pretended Senſe of the word *Creature*, or *Created*, does not ſeem to have prevailed ſo early as St. *John*'s Time. He tells us, all Things were made *by Him*, that is, by the Λόγος; and *without Him, was not any Thing made that was made.* Might He not better have ſaid, in ſhort, all Things were *created*, neither was there any thing but what was *created*; It was perfectly needleſs, if your pretence be true, to inſert, *by Him*; becauſe, in the *Scripture-Senſe* of the Word, it was implied, and the Addition of it only renders it Tautology.

You go on to ſay, *it is, I think, for this reaſon, that the Scriptures never ſay that He is created.* Ingenuouſly confeſs'd; and therefore I hope you will not preſume, either to *ſay*, or to *believe*, that *He is created.* As to the *reaſon* you aſſign for it, it is meer Fancy and Fiction: I hope, out of pure Reverence to the *ſacred Writ*, you will bethink your ſelf of ſome better. You add, on the other Hand, that the Scriptures *never ſay that He is uncreated*; forgetting what you had acknowledged, in the ſame Page, viz. *That the Creator of all Things muſt be Himſelf uncreated, is an unavoidable conſequence in Reaſon:* And

that

that the Λόγος had *created* all Things you admit, immediately after, as delivered in Scripture. Wherefore, if Scripture, by *unavoidable Conſequence*, does ſay, that He is *uncreated*; I hope, Scripture does *ſay it*. The Scriptures, every where, carefully keep up the Diſtinction between *Creator, and Creature*; and never confound Both in one. They tell us not of any Creature of the *Father*'s, which is not a Creature of the *Son*'s alſo. They ſay, that *all Things were made by Him*; and to be more expreſſive and emphatical, *without Him was not any Thing made that was made.* How can this be, if He Himſelf was made? *Si Ipſe Factus eſt, non per Illum ſunt omnia facta, ſed cætera*; ſaith St. *Auſtin.*

As to the Senſe of the *Ante-Nicene* Writers, in this particular, it is well known that they do *implicitely* and *conſequentially*, almoſt every where, declare the Son to be *uncreated.* You may ſee ſome * Teſtimonies referred to in the Margin, where they do it alſo *directly*, and in *expreſs* Words. I ſcruple not to put *Origen* amongſt Them: His Orthodoxy has been effectually defended by the Incomparable Biſhop *Bull*, in the Opinion of the ableſt and moſt impartial Judges. The learned Doctor, notwith-

* Athenagoras, Legat. p. 39. Ed. Ox. Ignat. ad Epheſ. c. 7. p. 14. Ed. Ox. Irenæus, l. 2. c. 25. p. 153. Ed. Bened. Origen, Contr. Celſ. l. 6. p. 287. Dionyſ. Rom. apud Athanaſ. de Decret. Syn. N. p. 232. Dionyſius Alexand. apud Eund. 230. 253. 257. Theognoſtus —— apud Eund. 230. Methodius apud Phot. p 959. Hippolytus *(probably)* de Theol. & Incarn. p. 228.

ſtanding, has been pleaſed to revive the Diſpute about *Origen*'s Sentiments: with what Succeſs, ſhall be here examin'd, as briefly as may be. The Words of *Origen*, which [a] He lays hold on, are theſe. [b] Πρεσβύτατον πάντων τῶν δημιουργημάτων, applied to the Son. Bishop *Bull*, like a skilful and a candid Man, who did not care to ſet *one ambiguous* Sentence againſt *many plain* ones; nor to make an Author manifeſtly inconſiſtent, without as manifeſt a neceſſity; rendred the Words, very rightly, *Antienter than all Creatures*. The Doctor Himſelf is forc'd to [c] admit, that the Words might bear this Conſtruction: And yet [d] afterwards ſays, that *Origen expreſly reckon'd the Son among the* δημιουργήματα. But how *expreſly*? This can never be proved meerly from the Force of πρεσβύταλον, as a *Superlative*: unleſs [e] *Euſebius expreſly* reckon'd the Son among *Times* and *Ages*; or [f] *Juſtin* Martyr *expreſly* reckon'd the *Pentateuch* among *profane* Hiſtories; or the ſame [g] *Juſtin expreſly* reckon'd *Moſes* and the *Prophets* among the *Wiſe-Men* of *Greece*: which is ridiculous. The *Superlative*, we ſee, hath been uſed ſometimes *Comparatively*; and why not

a Script. Doctr. p. 184. 278. 282.

b Orig. Contr. Celſ. l. 5. p. 257.

c Script. Doctr. p. 184. d Script. Doctr. p. 282.

e Παντος χρόνε καὶ πάντων αἰώνων πρεσβύτατος. De Laud. Conſtant. c. 1. p. 501. Valeſ.

f Ἀρχαιοτάτων παισῶν τῶν ἔξωθεν Ιστοριῶν τὴν Μωϋσέως Ἱστορίαν. Paræn. c. 12. p. 70. Ed. Ox.

g Πρεσβύτατος Μωϋσῆς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ σοφῶν γεγόνασι πάντων τῶν παρ' ὑμῖν σοφῶν. Paræn. c. 35. p. 118.

by

by *Origen?* He may only *appear* to say, what He *really* does not. There is certainly a wide Difference between *verbally* seeming to assert, and *expressly* asserting; as much as between being barely capable of such a Sense, and being capable of no other Sense. How then will the learned Doctor be able to make good his Pretensions? He * alledges the *whole Tenor of* Origen's *Opinion*; In which He greatly mistakes: For the *whole Tenor* of *Origen*, especially in that Treatise from whence the Passage is taken, is altogether contrary; as the Learned well know, and Bishop *Bull* hath clearly shown. But the Doctor has a farther plea from a Passage in † *Athanasius*, which He seems to be much pleased with; referring to it, once, and again, in his *Scripture-Doctrine*. The principal Words are these: Τὸν ᾧ ὁ κτίστως κύριον, ᾧ πάσης ὑποστάσεως δημιουργόν. The Doctor thinks He has here discovered a ‡ *Contra-distinction* between ὁ κτίστως (He neglects κύριον) and πάσης ὑποστάσεως δημιουργόν We are to *suppose* πάσης ὑποστάσεως of larger Extent and Signification than πάσης κτίστως would have been: and, because δημιουργὸν goes along with it, we are to *suppose* that δημιούργημα was understood, by *Athanasius*, in a larger Sense than κτίσις: Lastly, we are to *suppose* that *Athanasius* is, in this

* Scrip. Doctr. p. 184.

† Τοῦτον μόνον εἶναι Θεὸν ἀληθῆ, τὸν ᾧ ὁ κτίστως κύριον, καὶ πάσης ὑποστάσεως δημιουργόν. πῶς δὴ ὃν ἐστιν ἕτος ἀλλ' ἢ ὁ παντάρχος ᾧ ὑπερπέκεινα πάσης γενητῆς ἐπίας, ὁ Θ Χριστοῦ πατήρ. Orat. Contr. Gent. p. 39. Ed. Bened.

‡ Script. Doctr. p. 184.

Inſtance, the beſt Interpreter of *Origen*, tho' it does not appear from *Origen*'s own Writings, that He knew any thing of this peculiar Senſe of δημιούργημα; but the Contrary. The bare Recital of ſo many *Suppoſitions*, advanc'd without Proof, or any Shadow of it, might ſuffice for an Anſwer. But we may obſerve.

1. That if *Athanaſius*, being then a young Man and an Orator, intended only to vary his Phraſe; either to be more emphatical, or to give the better Turn and Cadence to a Period (and this might be all, for any thing that appears to the Contrary) then the Doctor's *Criticiſm* falls to the Ground.

2. If any *Contra-diſtinction* was intended, it ſhould ſeem that the ſame muſt hold, with reſpect to κύριον and δημιουργὸν: the Conſequence whereof is, that God the Father is not κύριος ſo far and wide as He is δημιουργὸς. It will be ſome Satisfaction to us, that, if the Son be δημιούργημα, He has no *Lord over Him.*

3. The conſtant uſe of δημιούργημα and δημιουργὸς, in other Authors, and even in *Athanaſius* Himſelf, and in this very * Treatiſe, is another ſtrong Preſumption againſt the Doctor's *Criticiſm.*

* Τὰ μὲν ὑπὸ ἐθεοποιησαν, τῇ κτίσῃ παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα λατρεύοντες, πρᾶγμα πάσχοντες οἷόπερ καὶ δυσεβές. Ὅμοιον γὰρ εἴ τις τὰ ἔργα αὖ τῶν τεχνιτῶν θαυμάσειε, καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ πόλει δημιουργήματα καταπλαγείς τὸ τέκτονα δημιουργὸν καταπαύοι, p. 46. *The Words* δημιουργήματα *and* δημιουργὸν *anſwer, in the Similitude and Analogy, to* κτίσι *and* κτίσαντα, *going before. Wherefore, I conceive, that, according to* Athanaſius, *the Two former, when underſtood with relation to God, are equivalent to the Two latter.*

4. The

4. The Conſequences following from the Suppoſition of ſuch a Senſe, as the Doctor would impoſe upon *Athanaſius*, may be demonſtrably confuted from the ſame Treatiſe; nay, from the very ſame Page where that remarkable Paſſage is.

For, you muſt know, that, if the Doctor underſtands Him right, *Athanaſius* included the Son under πάσης ὑποστάσεως, whereof the Father is δημιουργὸς: And ſo the Son muſt be δημιούργημα according to *Athanaſius*. Not only ſo, but He muſt alſo come under πάσης γενητῆς φύσεως; which, for the purpoſe, the learned Doctor took care to render *all* [a] *derivative Being*, anſwering to his rendring of δημιούργημα [b] afterwards. This might look fair and plauſible, had we only that ſingle Sentence of *Athanaſius* to form a Judgment by: But it ſtands in a pretty large Treatiſe; wherein we find that *Athanaſius* is ſo far from ſuppoſing the Son to be δημιούργημα, that He makes Him [c] ποιητὴς of *all the inviſible Powers*; nay and [d] δημιουργὸς τῶν παντὸς, which, I think, comes to as much as δημιουργὸς πάσης ὑποστάσεως; and that therefore the learned Doctor may almoſt as reaſonably bring the Father in, among the δημιουργήματα of the Son, as *vice verſa*. To conclude; *Athanaſius*, within a few lines of that Paſſage which the Doctor makes uſe of, exempts the Son, clearly and expreſly, from the Rank of

a Script. Doctr. p. 4. b Script. Doctr. p. 278.
c Pag. 43. d Pag. 29.

ſuch

ſuch *derivative Beings*, as the Doctor would place Him with: * Ἄλλος μέν ἐστι τῶν γενητῶν, καὶ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως. So much for *Athanaſius*, and the Doctor's Criticiſms upon Him. Now, if you pleaſe, let *Origen* be Our's again, till you can better make out your Title to Him. I do not know that the Doctor has ſaid any thing conſiderable to weaken the Evidence of any other of the Authors, referr'd to in the Margin. So we may leave Them as They are; and proceed to another *Query*.

Query XIII.

Whether there can be any Middle between being made out of nothing, and out of ſomething; that is, between being out of Nothing, and out of the Father's Subſtance; between being eſſentially God, *and being* a Creature? *Whether, conſequently, the Son muſt not be either* eſſentially God, *or elſe a* Creature?

HERE, again, I have run two *Queries* into one, being nearly allied to each other, for the conveniency of Method. Queſtions of this kind you like not: *It is*, you ſay, preſſing you to *determine Things not clearly revealed:* As if you had not *determin'd* already upon the Points in Queſtion; or were at all afraid of doing it. Permit me to ſay, you have determin'd: But becauſe the Con-

* Pag. 39.

Concluſion is too ſhocking to appear in broad Terms, and too weak to bear; therefore you keep it under Cover, and lay Colours upon it, the better to deceive and draw in an unwary Reader: This is what I complain of. Let every Reader be apprized, that the only Queſtion between us is, whether His Creator and Redeemer, be a *Creature*, or no: and then the Cauſe will be brought to a ſhort Iſſue; and it will ſoon be ſeen where the Truth lies. It is not that I deſire to draw you into danger of *Cenſure*, of which you are apprehenſive; I could not have a Thought ſo mean: Beſides that I intended, and deſired, for the greater freedom of debate, to be private: And You, perhaps, may be ſo ſtill, if you pleaſe. It concerns every honeſt Man to have the Cauſe fairly laid open. While you are endeavoring to expoſe the *received* Opinion, as much as you are able, let *your own* be ſhown in its *true Colours*, and then ſet againſt it; that ſo we may the more eaſily judge, which has the Advantage upon the Compariſon. You are very ſenſible, I doubt not, that the Arguments againſt the Son's being a *Creature*, bear upon you with ſuch Strength, Force, and full Light; that you had rather have the pinch of the Queſtion conceal'd from the Reader, or diſguiſed under other Terms. The Antient *Arians*, the immediate Succeſſors of *Arius*, found it abſolutely neceſſary to *refine* upon their Leader: to refine, I mean, *in Language*; for

for their Faith was the ſame. When the World was, in a manner, their own; and when They were ſo far from fearing *cenſure* themſelves, that they imploy'd the ſecular Power to [a] plunder, perſecute, and deſtroy as many as oppoſed Them; even *then*, Thoſe Men durſt not ſay *directly*, that the Son of God was *a Creature*. We have Creed after Creed drawn up by Them; and *Arius*'s Poſitions [b] expreſly diſclaim'd by ſome of Them; tho', at the ſame time, They meant the ſame Things. And what was the meaning of this wary Proceeding; this walking in diſguiſe, while they had nothing to fear from the Powers in Being? The Reaſon is plain: Their Doctrine was *new*, and [c] *ſhocking* to Chriſtian Ears. It was not fit to appear in [d] clear and plain Words. It was to be inſinuated only, in remote Hints, and dark *Innuendo's*. People were to be decoy'd, and gradually drawn into a *new* Faith; which if they had fully underſtood, and ſeen what it led to, they would immediately have deteſted. See to this purpoſe a [e] Paſſage of *Hilary* worth remarking; which I have thrown into the Margin.

a *See* Athanaſ. Vol. 1. p. 110. 317. 321. 345. 362. 386. Hilar. p. 1291. Baſil. Ep. 70, 71. 182. Greg. Naz. Orat. 20. 23. 25. 32.

b Athanaſ. Vol. 1. p. 176. 275. Vol. 2. p. 735. Socrat. l. 2. c. 10. Sozom. E. Hiſt. l. 3. c. 5. Epiphan. Hæreſ. 73. p. 845.

c Athanaſ. Vol. 1. p. 283, Alexand. Epiſt. Theod. H. p. 26. 30.

d *See* Athanaſ. Vol. 1. p. 288.

e Hujus quidem uſque adhuc Impietatis Fraude perficitur, ut jam ſub Antichriſti Sacerdotibus Chriſti *Populus* non occidat, dum Hoc putant Illi *Fidei* eſſe quod *vocis* eſt. Audiunt *Deum* Chriſtum;

The

The *Arians*, or *Semi-Arians* (for both come to one at laſt) were ſo ſenſible that their Tenets would not bear the Light, that they were forc'd to diſguiſe and conceal Them under *Catholick* Forms of Speech, with all imaginable Art and Subtlety; as was much complain'd of by the * *Catholicks*, who abhorr'd ſuch Artifices. The myſtery of theſe Diſguiſes has been already intimated. Had they ventured to ſpeak out, they could not have deceived any great Numbers. The greater part of their deluded Followers were blinded and hood-wink'd; and hardly knew what their Leaders intended, or whither they were driving. Theſe were the Arts, by which *Arianiſm* prevailed; and yet hardly prevailed above Forty Years. Whether theſe, or the like prudential Reaſons, determine ſome now to proceed with the like Caution, and to avoid declaring, in Terms, that the Son of God is a *Creature*, I know not. But this I know, that every careful Reader ought to be well apprized of the Tendency of your main Doctrine. It ſhould be told, that you aſſert, though not *directly* and *plainly*, yet *tacitely* and *conſequentially*, that the Maker, Redeemer,

putant eſſe quod dicitur. Audiunt *Filium Dei*; putant in Dei Nativitate ineſſe Dei Veritatem. Audiunt *Ante Tempora*, putant id ipſum *Ante Tempora*, eſſe quod Semper eſt. Sanctiores Aures plebis quam Corda Sacerdotum. Hilar. pag. 1266. *See alſo* Sozom. E. H. l. 3. c. 5.

* Athanaſ. p. 235. 224, 895. Theod. E. H. p. 27. Socrat. E. H. l. 2. c. 45. Sozom. E. H. l. 4. c. 29. Epiphan. Hæreſ. 73. p. 845. Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. 21. p. 387.

and

and Judge of the whole World, is no more than a *Creature*; is mutable, and corruptible; depends entirely upon the Favour and good Pleasure of God; has a precarious Existence, and dependent Powers, finite and limited; and is neither so perfect in his Nature, nor so exalted in Privileges, but that it is in the *Father*'s Power, according to his own good Pleasure, to create Another equal, or even Superior, to Him. These are your Tenets, if you please to speak out; and these, in the main, are what *Arius*, being a plain, open, and consistent Man, at the beginning, very frankly profess'd. But, if these Positions appear so harsh and shocking, that you your Selves, who admit Them, do not care to own them in *plain Terms*; it may be very excusable in *Others* to contradict Them; and to assert, upon so great Evidences of Truth, from Scripture and Antiquity, that God the Son is *infinitely* removed from the Condition of a *Creature*; is *really*, *truly*, and *essentially* God.

You have, it may be, some few specious Difficulties to urge against a *Trinity in Unity*, *eternal Generation*, or the like; points too sublime for Men, or, it may be, Angels to comprehend. But why must these be thought to weigh down the many and unanswerable Objections against your own Scheme; or be esteem'd sufficient to bear up against the united Voice of Scripture and Catholick Antiquity, no

no where aſſerting that the Son of God is a *Creature*; but every where intimating, inculcating, proclaiming, that He is the *Creator*, *Preſerver*, and *Suſtainer* of all Things; very and eternal God. You'l pardon me this Excurſion, neceſſary to give the common Reader a juſt Idea of the Diſpute betwixt us; and of the *true ſtate* of the Queſtion. A Stranger in this Controverſy, finding how near we come to each other in *expreſſion*, might be apt to wonder wherein we differ, or what it is that we diſpute about; not being aware of the Artifice you make uſe of, in giving an *Uncatholick* meaning to *Catholick* Expreſſions. We ſay, the Son is not *Self-exiſtent*, meaning that He is not *unoriginate*: You do not only ſay the ſame, but contend for it; meaning, not *neceſſarily-exiſting*. We ſay, *not unoriginate*, meaning that He is not the *Head* or *Fountain*, not the *firſt Perſon* of the Trinity: You take up the very ſame Word, and zealouſly contend that the Son is not *unoriginate*; underſtanding it in reſpect of *Time*, or *Duration*. We ſay, the Son is *ſubordinate*, meaning it of a Subordination of *Order*, as is juſt, and proper: You alſo lay hold of the word *Subordinate*, and ſeem wonderfully pleas'd with it; but underſtanding by it, an *Inferiority* of *Nature*. We ſay, that the Son is not abſolutely *ſupreme* nor *independent*, intimating thereby that He is *Second* in Order as a Son, and has no *ſeparate*, *independent* Exiſtence from the Father,

Father, being *co-eſſentially* and *co-eternally* one with Him: you alſo take up the ſame Words, interpret them to a *low* Senſe, and make the Son an *inferior dependent* Being; *depending* at firſt on the *Will* of the Father for his Exiſtence, and afterwards for the continuance of it. This is the way you chuſe to inſinuate your Heterodoxy into weak Readers. In the mean while, notwithſtanding our *ſeeming* or *verbal* Agreement, there is as wide a Difference between what You teach and We, as between *finite* and *infinite*, *mutable* and *immutable*, a *dependent Creature* and the *eternal God*. From what hath been ſaid, you may perceive what the *Conceſſions* of *Catholicks*, which the Doctor often boaſts of, amount to. The *Catholicks* have uſed ſome Phraſes, in a *good Senſe*, which artful Men have perverted to a *bad* one: That is all the Caſe. But I return.

You was to find a *medium* between being *eſſentially God*, and being a *Creature:* or elſe to declare, in plain Terms, that the Son is a *Creature*. A *medium* you find not, nor indeed can there be any: And yet, inſtead of frankly acknowledging ſo plain and manifeſt a Truth, you are pleas'd to ſhift, double, and wind about, in a manner unbecoming a grave Diſputant, or a ſincere and ingenuous Writer. In the firſt place, you put on an Air of Courage, and give me *one Caution*, viz. *not to ſay or attempt to prove, that every Being that is derived muſt be, for that reaſon, a Creature*, for fear of making

making my *own Notion*, which supposes the Son *generated*, that is, *derived*, to favour the *Arians:* But, admitting the Son to be *derived*, as it may be understood in a *Catholick* Sense, yet what is that to your Purpose? Does not my Argument turn upon the Words, *out of nothing*? Point me out any Being *so derived*, a Being which now is, and once *was not*; and deny Him to be *a Creature*, if you can. But you go on: *As to what is said in the Queries, that either the Son of God must be the* Individual *Substance of the Father, or else* ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, *with the* Arians; *I answer, if both Scripture and Reason clearly demonstrate that the Son is not the* Individual *Substance of the Father, who must look to that Consequence, if it be one?*

Here, at a strait (as usual) the word *Individual* comes in; a word capable of several meanings; and so necessary to help Invention, that you would often be at a loss what to say, if you wanted that poor pretence for Equivocation. It is evident, that you all along use the Word in a *Sabellian* Sense, different from what either the *School-men*, or more antient *Catholicks* intended by it. The thing which I assert is this; that you must either own the Son to be of the same *undivided* Substance with the Father; or else declare Him *a Creature*. If you deny the former, you must, of Consequence, admit the latter; and you *really* do so. The consequence *You* are to

look to, as neceſſarily flowing from *your* Premiſes; which you pretend to found on Scripture and Reaſon, without any ground or warrant from either. You are reſolved, it ſeems, to diſown the *certainty* of *the diſjunction*, (*p.*61.) ſo afraid you are of determining the Son to be *a Creature*, ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων. Let us hear what a *Diſputant* may have to plead againſt a Thing as clear and evident as any *Axiom* in Geometry.

You ſay, **The* Nicene *Fathers thought the Son to be neither the* οὐσία τοῦ πατρὸς, *The Subſtance of the Father, nor* ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, *but* ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, *from the Subſtance of the Father.* The *Nicene* Fathers explain their meaning, both in the *Creed* it ſelf, and in the *Anathemas* annex'd to it; determining the Son to be no *Creature*, nor a different God from the Father; but of the ſame *undivided* Subſtance with Him, *God of God*, *Light of Light*, *Conſubſtantial* with Him, and a diſtinct Perſon from Him.

Next, you ſay, *you dare not determine that God produced all Things, or any Thing, (ſtrictly and metaphyſically ſpeaking) out of Nothing.* Extreme Modeſty! That you dare not determine whether God has properly *created* any Thing; or whether all Things were not *neceſſarily-exiſting*. *Matter* it ſelf may have been *co-eval* and *co-eternal* with God the Father; *Any thing*, it ſeems, but his own *beloved* and *only-begotten* Son: Or elſe why are you ſo

* *See Dr.* Clarke's *Reply to the Convocation*, p. 29.

ſhy,

ſhy, at other times, of acknowledging His Eternity? Or why ſo reſolute in diſputing againſt it? An *eternal Son*, methinks, is much better Senſe than an *eternal Subſtance*, *not divine*, and a *Son made* out of it; which is what you muſt mean, or mean nothing. But to proceed: You add, *How God brings Beings into real Exiſtence we know not, becauſe we know not their Eſſences.* Therefore, I ſuppoſe, we know not, whether He brings them into Exiſtence at all; or whether they had a Being before they were *created:* That's the Conſequence you intend, if any thing to the purpoſe. You go on: *Or whether it be a Contradiction to predicate Exiſtence of them before their coming into that State which they now are in, and which we call their Creation, we know not.* Very Ignorant! And yet you can be poſitive in Things, which you know a great deal leſs of; preſuming to make the *Generation* of the Son of God *Temporal*; and determining it * a Contradiction to predicate *Exiſtence* of Him before His *Generation.* Such Things as theſe carry their own Confutation with them; and only ſhow that Truth is too ſtubborn to bend. Let it be ſaid then plainly, and without diſguiſe, that the Son of God is either *Conſubſtantial* with God the Father; or elſe a *Creature.* There is no *medium*, neither can there be any; conſiſtent with Scripture, and with the truth and reaſon of Things. This being ſettled, our Diſpute

may be brought into a narrower Compass; and we may hereafter dismiss doubtful and ambiguous Terms.

QUERY XIV.

Whether Dr Clarke *who every where denies the Consubstantiality of the Son, as absurd and contradictory, does not, of Consequence, affirm the Son to be a Creature* ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, *and so fall under his own censure, and is Self-condemn'd?*

IT hath been question'd by some, whether Dr. *Clarke* has really given into the *Arian* Scheme, or no. From what He saith, in some places of his *Scripture-Doctrine*, (particularly * Prop. 14 and 16.) one might imagine that He stood *Neuter*; neither determining for, nor against the *Catholick* Faith, in that Article: But, from his declaring † expresly against the *Consubstantiality* of the Son, whether *Specifick* or *Individual*, (between which He allows no *medium*) and from his reckoning the Son among the δημιουργήματα, tho' He gives an artificial gloss to it; as also from his excluding the Son out of the *One* Godhead; from these Considerations, to mention no more, it is exceedingly clear, that He has determin'd against the Church; and declared for *Arianism*. He has, by necessary Consequence, asserted the Son to

* Script. Doctr. p. 276. 279. † *See* Script. Doctr. p. 465.

be

be ἐξ ὐκ ὄντων; which is the very Essence and Characteristick of *Arianism*. By so doing, He is Self-condemn'd (*See Prop.* 14.) unless affirming a thing *expressly* be highly blameable; and affirming the same thing, *implicitely* and *consequentially*, be just and good. It is unaccountable to me, how there comes to be such a charm in Words, that a Man should be blameable for saying a Thing of this Nature, plainly and directly, which He may affirm indirectly and consequentially, without any fault at all. Doth the Offence lie only in Sounds or Syllables? Or was *Arius* more culpable for saying, the Son was a *Creature*, and *from nothing*, than Another who says, He is not *Consubstantial* with the Father, nor *One God* with Him, or the like; when it is so very manifest, and hath been proved above, that they are only different Expressions of the same Thing? I can think but of three *Reasons* (I speak not of particular *Views*, or *Motives*) why any Man should condemn *Arius* for declaring the Son to be ἐξ ὐκ ὄντων. Either because the Proposition is *false*; or because it is *dubious*; or because it is not, in *express* Words, contain'd in Scripture.

If the Doctor believed it *false*, He could not, consistently, disown the *Consubstantiality* and *Co-eternity*; If He thought it *dubious*, He must have observed a *Neutrality* in this Controversy; which He has not done: The *Third* Reason would bear too hard upon many of the Doctor's Fifty Five *Propositions*. The Conclusion,

which I draw from these Premises, pursuant to the Query laid down, is, that the learned Doctor, in condemning *Arius*, has implicitely condemn'd Himself. It was as necessary to take notice of this, as it is to take off Disguises, and to prevent a Reader's being misled by *fair* Pretences. Let Things appear what they really are, without Art or Colouring; and then, if you can make any Advantage of 'em, in God's Name, do so; and, if your Cause be just, it will thrive the better for it.

Query XV.

Whether He also must not, of consequence, affirm of the Son, that there was a Time when He was not, *since* God *must exist before the* Creature; *and therefore is again Self-condemn'd*, (See Prop. 16. Script. Doctr.) *And whether He does not* equivocate *in saying*, * *elsewhere, that the second Person has been* always *with the First*; *and and that there has been* no Time, *when He was not so: And lastly, whether it be not a vain and weak Attempt to pretend to any middle way between the* Orthodox *and the* Arians; *or to carry the Son's Divinity the least higher than They did, without taking in the Consubstantiality?*

I Could have been willing to have had this, and other the like Queries, relating more to the Doctor Himself, than to the Cause, drop'd. But

* Script. Doctr. p. 438.

since

ſince you have thought fit to *publiſh* Them, preſuming your ſelf able to defend the Doctor in every Thing; you have brought a kind of neceſſity upon me, of ſhowing how little ground you have for your Aſſurance in this particular; and that the Doctor will ſtill want ſome better Advocate.

He condemns, in his * *Scripture-Doctrine*, Thoſe *who pretending to be wiſe above what is written, and intruding into Things which they have not ſeen, have preſumed to affirm, that there* WAS A TIME WHEN THE SON WAS NOT. Who would think, after this, that He ſhould be the Man who ſhould *preſume* to do it? Yet nothing is more evident than that He denies the *Eternity* of the Son; which is the very ſame as to affirm, that *there was a time when the Son was not.* He denies it, by plain Conſequence. in ſuppoſing the Son to be ἐξ ὐκ ὄντων, as was ſhown under the laſt *Query*; and beſides, He expreſly ſays, in his † Comments on the *Athanaſian* Creed (which contain what Himſelf ſubſcribes to) that *there are not three eternal Perſons.* It muſt indeed be own'd, that in his Paper laid before the Biſhops, *July* 2. 1714. He profeſſes that the Son was *eternally begotten by the eternal Will and Power of the Father.* But, after a Friend of his had diſcovered ſome uneaſineſs at that Paſſage, as looking like a *Retractation* of his former Opi-

* Prop. 6. p. 279.
† Script. Doctr. p. 429.

nion, and as admitting the Son's *Eternity*, He * took care to explain it away; and to signify that, tho' He had said the Son was *eternally* begotten, He did not mean it in the strict and proper Sense. " My Intention, says He, was " not to assert any thing different from what " I had before written; but only to show that " I did not in any of my Books teach (as had " by many been industriously reported) the " Doctrine of *Arius* (*viz.* that the Son of " God was a Creature made out of Nothing, " just before the Beginning of the World) but " that He was begotten *Eternally*, that is, " without any Limitation of Time, (ἀχρόνως, " πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, πρεσαιωνίως, πρὸ πάντων " αἰώνων) in the incomprehensible Duration of " the Father's Eternity. This is too plain to need any Comment.

I shall only observe to the Reader, how the Doctor singles out one particular Point, wherein He differs from *Arius*; whereas it is justly questionable whether that was *Arius*'s *settled* Opinion or no. Any one that will be at the pains to read over *Arius*'s Letters, extant in † *Theodorit* and ‡ *Athanasius*, will easily see, that the principal Thing which stuck with Him, was the τὸ ἀΐδιον or συναΐδιον, the strict *Eternity* or *Co eternity* of the Son. As to other lesser Matters, He would easily have compounded with the *Catholicks*; and would never have

* *Letters*, Numb. 8. † E. H. l. 1. c. 5.
‡ De Synod. Arim. p. 729.

scrupled,

ſcrupled, in the leaſt, to carry the point as high as the Doctor does. He was content, for the moſt part, to ſay, *There was a Time when the Son was not*, without defining the *preciſe* Time of his *Generation*, or *Creation*. To make it the more clearly appear, that He was perfectly of the Doctor's Sentiments, in this particular, it is obſervable that He uſes nearly the very ſame Words, which the Doctor does: (* Ἀχρόνως, † πρὸ χρόνων καὶ πρὸ αἰώνων, ‡ πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων) Words, tho' not exactly the ſame, yet full as high and ſtrong as Thoſe which the Doctor explains his own Senſe of *Eternity* by. So that the Doctor has no reaſon to diſclaim *Arius*; or to endeavor to perſwade the World that He differs from Him, in any thing material relating to this Controverſy. But to return: The Words *eternal*, *always*, or the like, are plain *Engliſh* Words; and ſhould either not be uſed, in this caſe, at all, or uſed in their *true* and *proper* Senſe. You Apologize for it, as far as the Matter will bear: But it would be wiſer, and better, and more ingenuous, to give that Point up. Let us hear however what you have to ſay.

God could eternally act, that is, could in any point of duration of his own Exiſtence exerciſe his eternal Power and Will in producing Beings --- and therefore Beings diſtinct

* Epiſt. apud Athanaſ. p. 730.
† Athanaſ. ibid. Theod. c. 5. p. 21.
‡ Confeſſ. Arii. & Euz. apud Sozom. l. 2. c. 27. p. 395.

from

from the one ſupreme God may be ſaid to be Eternal, *as far as we are able to reaſon about Eternity* (*I mean as it is a negative Idea*) *ſo that we cannot conceive Time when they were not*, (p. 61.) What a number of Words are here, only to tell us, in a round about way, that the Son is *not Eternal*. What is this *negative* Eternity, but no Eternity? And why are not Angels, or Arch-angels called *Eternal*, ſince we know not preciſely when they were made, nor in what Time they began to exiſt; which is all the meaning of this new ſort of Eternity? Beſides, is not every *Creature* produced in ſome *Point of Duration*, in which God exerciſes his *eternal Power and Will* upon them? Are they therefore *Eternal*? As to your intimating of the Son, that *we cannot conceive Time when He was not*; it is not true, upon your Principles. We can conceive it as well of Him, as of any other Creature, Angel, or Arch-angel; if He was made in Time, that is, if He was *made* at all. We can conceive, and muſt conceive, that there were Millions and Millions of Ages backwards; an Eternity, *a parte ante*, before He came into Being. I hope, you intended not any Equivocation in the word, *Time:* But if you did, it is only putting *Duration* in the room of it, and then all will be right. The *Arians* would have been content to have had but one *moment* of Time admitted for the Father to be *prior*, and to *Will* the Exiſtence of the Son. This would have

have been enough to make the *Generation* of the Son sit easy upon their Minds. But the misfortune was, that one moment's *priority* of Time must infer an *infinite Priority*. The *Arians* saw it, and submitted to it. The Catholicks abhorr'd the Thought; and could not bear the Impiety of making the Son of God a *Creature*.

You endeavor to show that Dr. *Clarke* takes a middle way between the *Orthodox* and the *Arians*; by which you only happen to show how little you have been acquainted with the *Forms*, *Creeds*, and *Confessions* of the Antient *Arians*. The first * Instance you give of the Doctor's middle Way, is, that He does not plainly and directly say that the Son was *created*; He denies Him to be ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων. But herein, He only Copies after many of the Antient *Arians*; who, when accus'd by the Catholicks of making the Son a *Creature*, rejected the charge with great disdain, having this reserve, † *not a Creature* like other Creatures which are created *mediately* by the Λόγος: the same Evasion, which you are pleas'd to adopt for your own, (*p.* 60.) And it was ‡ frequent with the *Arians* to deny the Son to be ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων; or even to *Anathematize* those that should affirm it. A second Instance you give, of the Doctor's refining upon the *Arians*, is in the

* Pag. 60. † *See* Socrat. E. H. l. 2. c. 10. p. 73. Hieron. Dial. Contr. Lucif. p. 300. ‡ *See* Arian *Creeds*. Athanas. p. 738. Socrat. l. 2. c. 8. 19. 30. Sozom. l. 3. c. 11.

point

point of the Son's *Eternity*, (*p.* 61.) But I have ſhown you that He does not ſo much as go beyond *Arius* Himſelf, in that Point: Beſides that the [a] Antient *Arians* condemn'd thoſe that ſhould preſume to ſay, that *there was a Time when the Son was not*, equivocating upon the word, *Time*. Both your Inſtances, you ſee, fail you, being neither of them ſufficient to the purpoſe.

But, to ſet this Matter in a ſomewhat clearer Light, it may not be improper, in this Place, to exhibit a Draught or Repreſentation of the *Arian* Tenets or Principles; by which it will appear what *Arianiſm* really is, when purſued in its remoteſt Conſequences; and what the Difference is between Thoſe who only admit ſome part of it (as the Doctor and your Self) and Thoſe who receive the whole.

[b] *Poſitions of ſome, or other of the* Arians, *in reſpect of the Son.*

1. *Not* [c] *Conſubſtantial* with God the Father.

2. *Not* [d] *Co-eternal*, however begotten before all Ages, or without any known Limitation of Time.

3. Of a *diſtinct inferior Nature*, however otherwiſe perfectly like the Father.

a *See* Arian *Creeds*. Athanaſ. p. 738. Socrat. l. 2. c. 18, 19. Sozom. l. 3. c. 11.

b Athanaſ. p. 282. 398. 728. Sozom. l. 1. c. 15. Theod. Hæret. Fab. l. 4. c *This was agreed to unanimouſly.*

d *This Point diſputed by the* Pſathyrians. Theod. Hæret. Fab. l. 4. c. 4. p. 238.

4. *Not*

4. *Not strictly and essentially God*, but partaking of the Father's Divinity.

5. *A Creature of the Father's*, however unlike to the rest of the Creatures, or Superior to Them.

6. * *Not like the Father*; but in Nature and Substance, like other Creatures.

7. † *Made in Time*; there having been a Time when He was not, made from Nothing.

8. ‡ *Far inferior to the Father* in Knowledge, Power, and Perfections.

9. *Mutable in his Nature*, as a Creature, tho' unchangeable by Decree.

10. *Dependent* on the good Pleasure of the Father, for his past, present, and future Being.

11. *Not knowing the Father* perfectly, nor Himself. His Knowledge being that of a *Creature*, and therefore *finite*.

12. *Made a little before the World was made*; and for the sake of Those that should be after Him.

These are the *Arian* Principles brought down as low, as they can well go. *Arius*, the Author and Founder of the Sect, seems to have gone through all those Steps, at the first: And indeed, all of them, except the last, hang together; and are but the necessary Consequences

* *This denied by all but those called* Anomœans.

† *This denied, in Words, by many.*

‡ *Few bold enough to maintain expressly this, or any of the following Propositions.*

of

of each other. Thoſe that ſtop'd in the midway, or ſooner, might be more pious and modeſt; but leſs conſiſtent Men. A little Experience convinc'd, as well *Arius* Himſelf, as his Followers, that thoſe Poſitions, all together, were too grating upon, and too ſhocking to every pious Chriſtian at that Time. And therefore (without conſidering how one depended on another; or how a Principle could be maintain'd, and yet its plain, neceſſary Conſequences diſown'd) they immediately went to work, to cut off what ſhould appear moſt offenſive, and retain only what might ſound tolerably; eſpecially when worded in *ambiguous*, or *Catholick* Terms.

The nine laſt Particulars were, for ſome time, and by the *Arians* in general, waved, drop'd, not inſiſted on (as being too groſs to take) or elſe artfully inſinuated only, under ſpecious and plauſible Expreſſions. The *firſt* They all own'd, and inſiſted the moſt upon; having many Pretences to urge againſt *Conſubſtantiality*, either Name, or Thing. The *ſecond* and *third* They divided upon, as to the way of Expreſſion; ſome ſpeaking their Minds plainly, others with more reſerve; not ſo much denying the *Co-eternity*, as forbearing to affirm it. This was the method which the *Arians* took to propagate their Hereſy. We need not wonder if They were put hard to it, and were often forc'd to make uſe of Colluſions, Equivocations, and double Entendres. For, being obliged, for fear

fear of Offence, to uſe *Catholick* Words, tho' without a *Catholick* meaning; and to maintain their main Principle, without ſeeming to maintain its neceſſary Conſequences; (nay, ſeeming to deny and reject them) it could not be otherwiſe. And not only the *Catholicks* frequently complain of thoſe ſmooth Gentlemen, but ſome even of their * own Party could not endure ſuch Shuffling; thinking it became honeſt and ſincere Men, either to ſpeak out, or to ſay nothing. Of this kind were *Aetius*, and *Eunomius*, with their Followers, called *Anomæans* and *Exoucontii*, being indeed no other, in reſpect to the Son's Divinity, than ſuch as *Arius* was at firſt; and ſpeaking almoſt as plainly and bluntly as He did. After the Diſguiſes and Softenings, and Colourings had been carried on ſo long, till all Men of Senſe ſaw plainly that it was high time to leave off trifling, and to come from Words to Things; and that there was no *Medium*, but either to ſettle into *Orthodoxy*, or to ſit down with the pure *Arians* and *Anomæans*, (if they would determine any Thing, and be *ſincere* and *conſiſtent* Men) ſome choſe the former, and ſome the latter, according as they more inclined to one way, or the other. There is certainly no *Medium* betwixt *Orthodoxy* and *Arianiſm* (for † *Semi-Arianiſm*, if ſo under-

* *See* Epiphan. Hæreſ. 76. p. 916.

† *Semi-Arianus*, & *Semi-Deus*, & *Semi-Creatura* perinde monſtra & portenta ſunt, quæ Sani & Pii Omnes merito exhorrent. *Bull.* D. F. p. 284.

ſtood,

ſtood, is perfect Non-ſenſe and Contradiction) there being no *Medium* between *God* and *Creature*, between *Unmade* and *Made*. Men may conceal their Sentiments, ſuppreſs Conſequences, and ſpeak their Minds but by Halves; and ſo one *Arian* may be more cautious, or more artful than Another: But, in truth and reality, every Man that diſowns the *Conſubſtantiality*, rightly underſtood, is as much an *Arian*, as *Eunomius*, or *Aetius*, or any of the Antient *Arians* were; or even as *Arius* Himſelf, excepting only ſome few Particulars, which were not his ſtanding and ſettled Opinions.

In fine, there is but one middle way to take between the *Orthodox* and the *Arians*, and That is, to avoid determining on either ſide; to leave the point *in medio*, and to ſuſpend aſſent to either; to believe as much, and as high, as any of the *Arians* did; and as to the reſt, neither to believe, nor disbelieve it. But this is not the caſe, either with the Doctor, or your Self. You have declared againſt the *Conſubſtantiality*, and the proper *Divinity* of Chriſt, as well as *Co-eternity*: And are therefore ſo far from refining upon, that you really come ſhort of many of the Antient *Arians*; tho', to do you juſtice, you are the more conſiſtent with your ſelves for it. I have now ſufficiently vindicated every part of the *Query*; having ſhown that the *Equivocation*, in reſpect of the Son's *Eternity*, is juſtly chargeable upon the Doctor; and that He has not obſerved

ſerved a *neutrality* in this diſpute; nor carried the point higher than the Antient *Arians*; but has really, and fully given into their Sentiments; and therein determin'd againſt the *Catholick* Church. The uſe which I make of this, at preſent, is to obſerve to the Reader: 1. That the Doctor has not invented any new, or more excellent Scheme than was *thought of, conſider'd*, and *condemn'd*, near 1400 Years ago, by a very wiſe, numerous, and unbyaſs'd Council. 2. That He cannot juſtly cite any *Catholick Poſt-Nicene* Writer, (nor indeed *Ante-Nicene*) as certainly favouring his *main* Doctrine. 3. That his attempt to reconcile the *Nicene* and *Athanaſian* Creeds to *Arianiſm*, form'd in direct Oppoſition to it, is endeavoring to bring Light and Darkneſs, and the moſt irreconcilable Inconſiſtencies to meet together. This for the preſent: The future uſe I ſhall make of it, is to come directly to the point in Queſtion; for when it is certainly known what the drift deſign and meaning of an Author is, much Pains may be ſpared, and a Diſpute ſhortned.

I hardly know whether ſtrict method would permit me to take notice of the latter part of your Reply, (contain'd in Pages 62, 63, 64.) it is ſo wide and foreign. You muſt have had a great mind to ſay ſomething of *eternal Generation:* Otherwiſe you would never have introduc'd it in a place ſo improper. The pretence is, that we *equi-*

vocate in talking of eternal Generation; and therefore it is proper to retort it upon us, in answer to a charge of *Equivocation.* But wherein do we *equivocate*, or do any thing like it? Is it in the word, *Eternal?* But we undoubtedly mean it in the strict and proper Sense. Is it in the word, *Generation*? That is a word of Latitude, capable of more Senses than one. We use it in the Sense, which has prevail'd in the Church 1500 Years; and in a proper Sense, according to the Rule of *Tertullian*, *Omnis Origo Parens est.* And where then is the Impropriety, or *Equivocation* in the word, *Generation*, as used by us? True, it is not the same with Human *Generation.* But who will pretend that *Human* is to be the measure and standard of all *Generation? Generation*, you say, implies *Beginning*; and yet we call it * *Eternal.* Admit that it did so; yet till That can be made appear, we may be very *sincere* in calling it *Eternal*, intending no *Equivocation:* You have not proved that all *Generation* implies Beginning; and what is more, cannot. You endeavor to make the notion of it absurd: But, unless you can demonstrate the absurdity of it, how will you charge us with *Equivocation*, which was the Point? All you have to say turns only upon

* Μὴ χρονικὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ ὑιοῦ καταδέξῃ τινὲς λέγοντες, ἀλλὰ ἄχρονον ἀρχὴν γινώσκε τὴ πατέρα. Ἀρχὴ γὰρ ὑιοῦ ἄχρονος, ἀκατάληπτος. ἄναρχος ὁ πατὴρ, πηγὴ δ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ποταμοῦ, δ μονογενοῦς ὁ πατὴρ, ὁ γεννήσας αὐτὸν, καθὼς οἶδεν αὐτὸς μόνος. Cyril. Catech. 11. p. 145.

your

your miſconſtruction of, I ſhould ſay *Equivocation* in, the word *Individual*; which, you muſt needs know, we underſtand not in your Senſe of it; unleſs we are weak enough to ſuppoſe Father and Son to be *one Perſon*. You make another Argument, by *equivocating* in the word, *Production*; which if we uſe at all, we always take care to explain to a good Senſe; and never once imagine, that the *eternal* Generation is a *temporal* Production. You are very unhappy, to *equivocate* all the way, while you are retorting the charge of *Equivocation*; beſides that, could you have retorted it in a handſomer manner, it would not have been pertinent, becauſe it comes out of Place. For, your proper part here, is, not ſo much to object againſt our Scheme, as to defend your own: Pleaſe to clear your own *Hypotheſis* firſt; and then we may hear what you can ſay againſt ours. The Church of Chriſt has been in poſſeſſion of the preſent prevailing Doctrines, at leaſt, for 1400 Years: It concerns us, before we part with them, to ſee that we may have ſomething better in their ſtead. What if the Catholick Doctrine has ſome Difficulties? Has *Arianiſm* none? Or muſt we change the former for the latter? No, let us firſt conſider whether *Arianiſm* has not more and greater; and then perhaps we may ſee reaſon enough to keep as we are.

It is an uſual Thing with many (Moraliſts may account for it) when they meet with

a difficulty which They cannot readily anſwer, immediately to conclude that the Doctrine is Falſe; and to run directly into the oppoſite Perſwaſion: not conſidering that They may meet with much more weighty Objections there, than before; or that They may have reaſon ſufficient to maintain and believe many Things in *Philoſophy* or *Divinity*, tho' They cannot anſwer every Queſtion which may be ſtarted, or every Difficulty which may be raiſed againſt them. As to the Point we are upon; while ſome are conſidering only the Objections againſt the Doctrine of the Bleſſed Trinity (how *Three* can be *One*; how the *Son* could be *generated*; how *Perſon* and *Being* can be different; and the like) they imagine preſently, that the World, in a manner, has been hitherto miſerably miſtaken; and that They are the happy Men, who ſee clearly *how*, and *why*. Let but the very ſame Men have patience a while, and not imbark in the oppoſite Cauſe, till They are able to find out a truer and a juſter Scheme, and to clear it of all conſiderable Difficulties; I ſay, let Them but do thus, and then, I am perſwaded, They will be much leſs ſanguine in their purſuit of Novelties. In the preſent Controverſy, there are three Schemes, which I may call *Catholick*, *Sabellian*, and *Arian:* One of the Three muſt, in the main, be true. The way to know which, is, to weigh and conſider the Difficulties attending each reſpectively; and to ballance them one againſt another. The Advocates of the

the Two latter have performed reaſonably well, in the *offenſive* part; and eſpecially againſt *each other*: But have neither of them yet been able to *defend* their reſpective Schemes; nor, I ſuppoſe, ever will be. But I proceed.

Divine Worſhip due

To the one God.	To Chriſt.
Thou ſhalt have no other Gods before me, Exod. 20. 3.	*They worſhip'd Him*, Luk. 24. 52. *Let all the Angels of God worſhip Him*, Heb. 1. 6.
Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and Him only ſhalt thou ſerve, Matt. 4. 10.	*That all Men ſhould honour the Son, even as they honour the Father*, Joh. 5. 23.

QUERY XVI.

Whether by theſe (of the firſt Column) *and the like Texts, Adoration and Worſhip be not ſo appropriated to the one God, as to belong to Him only?*

THIS is a very material Enquiry, relating to the object of Religious Worſhip; than which nothing can be of greater Concernment. Here therefore, if any where, we might expect and demand of You a very full, clear, and ſatisfactory Anſwer. I ſhall examine your Anſwer, in due time and place. But, firſt, it will be

proper to ſhow what Reaſons we have to think, that all *religious* Worſhip is appropriated to God only. I ſhall enquire into the Senſe of Scripture, in this Article; and next proceed to the Judgment and Practice of the Antient Church, the beſt Comment upon Scripture.

Exod. 20. *v.* 3. hath been already produced. The Words are, *Thou ſhalt have no other Gods before* (or beſides) *me.* Which is farther explain'd, *v* 5. (the reaſon being the ſame, both with reſpect to Images and falſe Gods) *Thou ſhalt not bow down to Them, nor ſerve Them**. All Acts of Religious Worſhip are forbidden to be offered to any other *Being*, beſides the one Supreme God: to Him they are appropriated, to Him only. So *Deut.* 6. 13. *Thou ſhalt fear the Lord thy God, and ſerve Him:* And again *Deut.* 10. 20. *Thou ſhalt fear the Lord thy God; Him ſhalt thou ſerve.* Which is quoted, and explain'd by our Bleſſed Lord Himſelf, in theſe Words: *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and Him only ſhalt thou ſerve,* Matt 4 10. This was ſaid in anſwer to *Satan*, who did not pretend to be *Supreme*, nor deſire to be acknowledged as ſuch. (*See Luk.* 4. 6.) All He required was, that a ſolemn outward Act of Adoration and Worſhip ſhould be paid Him: And the reaſon given for refuſing it, is not that He was a *bad Spirit*, an Enemy to God; or that God had *not commanded* that He ſhould be worſhip'd; but the

* *See alſo* Exod. 22. 20.— 34. 14. Dan. 3. 28.

reaſon

reason is general, that none are to be worship'd but God only. And that these and the like Texts were intended to exclude all Beings, beside the one Supreme God, from being worship'd, either at *that Time*, or at any Time *after*, appears, not only from the reason of the Thing, but from plain Scripture. *Before me was there no God form'd, neither shall there be after me*, Isa. 43. 10. *If there arise among you a Prophet, or a Dreamer of Dreams, and giveth Thee a sign or wonder, and the sign or wonder come to pass, whereof He spake unto Thee, saying*, Let us go after other Gods (*which thou hast not known*) *and let us* serve Them, *Thou shalt not hearken*, &c. Deut. 13. 1, 2, 3. The Worship of the same one God, exclusive of all others, is by this for ever made unchangeable: Miracles could not be sufficient to give credit to any one, who should pretend to introduce another object of Worship; or to set up another God, beside the one Supreme God. All Creatures whatever are hereby effectually precluded from receiving any religious Homage and Adoration. This is confirm'd by St. *Paul* (*Rom.* 1. 21, &c.) who censures those that *knew God*, (that is, acknowledged one Supreme God) and yet *glorified Him not as God*, because *they served the Creature more than* (or besides) *the Creator*, who *is blessed for ever*. Wherein the Apostle plainly intimates, that the *Creator* only is to be *served*; and that the Idolatry of the Hea-

thens lay in their worſhiping of the *Creature*. He does not blame Them for giving *ſoveraign*, or *abſolute* Worſhip to the *Creatures* (They could hardly be ſo ſilly, as to imagine there could be more than one Supreme God) but for giving any *worſhip* at all, Soveraign or Inferior, Abſolute or Relative, to any Thing but the *Creator*. To the ſame purpoſe, *Gal.* 4. 8. He condemns thoſe who *did ſervice unto Them, which by nature were no Gods.* Which Text I ſhall take care to explain particularly, in another Place. All this is confirm'd and illuſtrated by the Angel, (*Rev.* 19. 10.---22. 9.) who refuſed to receive ſo much as the outward Act of Adoration; giving this Rule and Maxim upon it, *Worſhip God:* intimating thereby, that God only is to be *worſhip'd*; that all Acts of *religious* Worſhip are appropriated to God only. He does not ſay, worſhip God and *whom God ſhall appoint to be worſhip'd*; as if He had appointed any beſides God: nor worſhip God with *ſoveraign* Worſhip; as if any *inferior* ſort of Worſhip was permitted to be paid to Creatures; but ſimply, plainly, and briefly, *Worſhip God.* To this I may add, that the Reaſons which God inſiſts upon and inculcates, in the Old Teſtament, why He, and He alone, in oppoſition to all others, is to be *worſhip'd*, are ſuch as exclude all *Creatures.* His being *Jehovah*, * Creator, Suſtainer, Preſerver of all Things,

* *See* Iſa. 40. If. 45. 5, 6, 7. 2 King. 19. 15. Jer. 10. 10, 11, 12.

having

having no God before Him nor after Him, and the like.

This is the Scripture Account of the Object of Worſhip: There is neither Rule nor Example in it, for the worſhiping any Creature whatever; but all the Texts, relating to this Matter, are full, ſtrong, and clear for the Worſhip of God only. Now, whatever Reaſons Human Wiſdom may invent for the worſhiping of Creatures, beſides the *Creator* (as *Celſus* and *Porphyrie* of Old, and the *Romaniſts* of later Times, have pretended) thoſe are never to be ſet againſt a clear and plain Law; or oppoſed to the unerring Wiſdom of God, who beſt knows to whom Worſhip is proper to be paid, and to whom not.

I ſhall not here argue the Point from the Nature of the Thing it ſelf. I will ſuppoſe (without granting) that Creatures may be wiſe enough to know, ready enough to hear, and able to relieve our wants, at any Diſtance. I will ſuppoſe alſo, that one Creature may be appointed to bear Rule and to have Dominion over many; as ſome have thought particular *Angels* to preſide over ſuch and ſuch Kingdoms or Countries. I will ſuppoſe likewiſe, that it may ſeem to Human Wiſdom very fit and proper, that ſuch Creatures as can aſſiſt, or have the charge of others, ſhould be reſpected, *worſhip'd*, and *adored* by Them. I will ſuppoſe alſo, that we may be ſo ignorant as not to perceive any great harm, in theſe Suppoſitions, from the Nature

ture of the thing, barely and ſingly conſider'd. But God's *Thoughts are not our Thoughts:* He has been pleas'd to enter an expreſs *Caveat* and Prohibition in the Caſe; and has, no doubt, good reaſon for it. Poſſibly, He may apprehend it to be more for his own Glory, and more for our Good, that our *whole* Worſhip and Service be paid to Him, than a *part* only. Poſſibly, He may know (ſuch is Human Infirmity) that if any part, or kind, or degree of Religious Worſhip was permitted to be given to *Creatures*, it might inſenſibly alienate our Minds from the *Creator*; or eat out all our Reverence and Reſpect for God. Or, it may be, that while our Acknowledgments are order'd to be paid to Him, and to Him *alone*, we may thereby be induced to live more in dependence on Him; become more immediately united to Him; and have the greater love and eſteem for Him. He will not, perhaps, leave his Favors in the hands, or in the diſpoſal of his *Creatures*, leſt we ſhould forget whom we are principally obliged to; or leſt we ſhould imagine that He is not always every where preſent, to hear all our Petitions, and to anſwer them, according to his own good Pleaſure. Theſe, or a thouſand better Reaſons, infinite Wiſdom may have for appropriating all Acts of Religious Worſhip to God. It is ſufficient for us to know that He has done it: and of this Holy-Scripture has given abundant Proof, as we have before ſeen.

Now,

Now, I come to consider what you have to except against so clear a Truth. All is comprized in one short Sentence; one remarkable Distinction. *Absolute Supreme Honour is plainly appropriated to the Person of the Father only* (by *Exod.* 20. 3. Matt. 4. 10.) *as the absolute Supreme Being, or the one God*, (p. 94.) From which I am to infer, that *relative inferior* Worship may be paid to the *Creatures*, notwithstanding what has been urged, from the whole Tenor of Scripture and Antiquity, to the Contrary. This is the famed *Distinction*, pleaded by the Heathens of Old, for *Pagan*; by the *Romanists* of late, for *Popish*; and by You, for *Arian* Idolatry. I shall endeavor to convince you how little there is, either of Truth, or Probability, in this so celebrated *Distinction*; and then put an End to the Argument of this *Query*.

You set out unfortunately under a mistake, as if We were inquiring about Respect and Esteem, when the Question is entirely about *Acts* of *Religious* Worship. My Words were *Worship* and *Adoration*: Instead thereof, you put *Honour*, an ambiguous Word; and so slip over the Difficulty, which you was pinch'd with; and insensibly lead your Reader off from the Point, it concern'd you to speak to. Please to remember that we are disputing about *Acts* of Worship, *Religious* Worship. Let us keep to the *Terms* we began with; lest, by the changing of Words, we make a change of *Ideas*, alter

and alter the very ſtate of the Queſtion. This being premis'd, now I come directly to the Point in Hand. Your pretence is, that *ultimate*, *abſolute*, *ſupreme*, *ſoveraign* Worſhip is due to the *Father* only; *Mediate*, *relative*, *inferior*, *petty* Worſhip may be paid to *Creatures:* The outward Acts and Circumſtances ſuppoſed alike in Both, ſo far as to make Them *Religious*, not *Civil* Worſhip. Your *conſidering* the Father as *Supreme*, and your *intending* Him the *higheſt* Reſpect imaginable, are to make *His Worſhip* become *ſupreme*, *abſolute*, *ſoveraign* Worſhip: But your *conſidering* another Being as *inferior*, *dependent*, and a *Creature* only, and your *intending* Him no more than a *proportionate* Reſpect, are to make the Worſhip of Him become *inferior*, *relative*, *petty* Worſhip. Worſhip therefore is to take its Quality from the *Eſteem* and *Intention* of the Worſhipper, and is to be ſuppos'd *higher* and *lower* accordingly. This, I think, is your real and full Meaning, in as few and as plain Words, as I am capable of Expreſſing it. In anſwer to it, I obſerve as follows.

1. I can meet with nothing in Scripture to countenance thoſe fine-ſpun Notions. *Prayer* we often read of; but there is not a Syllable about *abſolute* and *relative*, *ſupreme* and *inferior* Prayer. We are commanded to pray *Fervently* and *Inceſſantly*; but never *Soveraignly* or *Abſolutely*, that I know of. We have

have no Rules left Us about *raiſing* or *lowering* our *Intentions*, in proportion to the *dignity* of the *Objects*. Some Inſtructions, to this purpoſe, might have been highly uſeful; and it is very ſtrange that, in a Matter of ſo great Importance, no Directions ſhould be given, either in Scripture, or, at leaſt, in Antiquity, how to regulate our *Intentions* and *Meanings*, with *Metaphyſical* Exactneſs; ſo as to make our Worſhip either *high*, *higher*, or *higheſt* of all, as occaſion ſhould require.

2. But a greater Objection againſt this Doctrine, is, that the whole Tenor of Scripture runs Counter to it. This may be underſtood, in part, from what I have obſerved above. To make it yet plainer, I ſhall take into Conſideration ſuch Acts and Inſtances of Worſhip, as I find laid down in Scripture; whether under the old or new Diſpenſation.

Sacrifice was one Inſtance of Worſhip required under the Law; and it is ſaid; *He that Sacrificeth unto any God, ſave unto the Lord only, He ſhall be utterly deſtroyed*, Exod. 22. 20. Now ſuppoſe any Perſon, conſidering with Himſelf that only *abſolute* and *ſoveraign* Sacrifice was *appropriated* to God, by this Law, ſhould have gone and *ſacrificed* to other Gods, and have been convicted of it before the Judges: The Apology He muſt have made for it, I ſuppoſe, muſt have run thus. "Gentlemen, "tho' I have ſacrificed to other Gods, yet, I "hope, you'l obſerve, that I did it not *abſo-*

"*lutely*:

" *lutely:* I meant not any *abſolute* or *ſu-*
" *preme* Sacrifice (which is all that the Law
" forbids) but *relative* and *inferior* only. I
" regulated my *Intentions* with all imaginable
" care; and my *eſteem* with the moſt critical
" Exactneſs: I *conſider'd* the other Gods,
" whom I ſacrificed to, as *inferior* only, and
" *infinitely* ſo; reſerving all *ſoveraign* Sacri-
" fice to the *ſupreme* God of *Iſrael.* This,
or the like Apology muſt, I preſume, have brought off the Criminal, with ſome applauſe for his Acuteneſs, if your Principles be true. Either you muſt allow this; or you muſt be content to ſay, that not only *abſolute ſupreme* Sacrifice (if there be any Senſe in that Phraſe) but *all Sacrifice* was, by the Law, *appropriate* to God only.

Another Inſtance of *Worſhip*, is making of *Vows*, *religious* Vows. We find as little Appearance of your famed Diſtinction here, as in the former caſe. We read nothing of *ſoveraign* and *inferior*, *abſolute* and *relative* Vows; that we ſhould imagine *ſupreme* Vows to be appropriate to God, *inferior* permitted to *Angels*, or *Idols*, or to any *Creature.*

Swearing is another Inſtance much of the ſame kind with the foregoing. Swearing, by *God's Name*, is a plain Thing, and well underſtood: But if you tell us of *ſoveraign* and *inferior* Swearing, according to the inward Reſpect or Intention you have, in Proportion to the Dignity of the Perſon by whoſe Name you Swear,

Swear, it must sound perfectly new to us. All Swearing which comes short in its Respects, or falls below *Soveraign*, will, I am afraid, be little better than *Profaness*.

Such being the Case, in respect of the Acts of Religious Worship already mention'd, I am now to ask you, what is there so peculiar in the Case of *Invocation* and *Adoration*, that They should not be thought of the same kind with the other? Why should not *absolute* and *relative* Prayer and Prostration appear as absurd, as *absolute* and *relative* Sacrifice, Vows, Oaths, or the like? They are Acts and Instances of *religious* Worship, like the other; appropriated to God in the same Manner, and by the same Laws, and upon the same Grounds and Reasons. Well then, will you please to consider, whether you have not begun at the wrong end, and committed an ὕστερον πρότερον in your way of thinking. You imagine that Acts of *religious* Worship are to derive their Signification and Quality, from the *intention* and *meaning* of the Worshippers; whereas the very reverse of it is the Truth. Their *Meaning* and *Signification* is fix'd and determin'd by God Himself; and therefore we are never to use them with any other meaning, under peril of Profaness or Idolatry. God has not left us at Liberty to fix what Sense we please upon *religious* Worship, to render it *high* or *low*, *absolute* or *relative*, at Discretion; *supreme* when offered to God, and if to others *inferior*;

inferior; as when to *Angels*, or Saints, or Images, in ſuitable Proportion. No: Religion was not made for *Metaphyſical* Heads only; ſuch as might nicely diſtinguiſh the ſeveral Degrees and Elevations of Reſpect and Honour among many Objects. The ſhort and plain way, which (in pity to Human Infirmity and to prevent Confuſion) it has pleaſed God to take with us, is to make all *religious* Worſhip his *own*; and ſo it is *ſoveraign* of Courſe. This I take to be the true *Scriptural*, as well as only *reaſonable* Account of the Object of Worſhip. We need not concern our ſelves (it is but vain to pretend to it) about determining the Senſe and Meaning of *religious* Worſhip. God Himſelf has took care of it; and it is already fix'd and determin'd to our Hands. It means, whether we will or no, it means, by Divine Inſtitution and Appointment, the *Divinity*, the *Supremacy*, the *Soveraignty* of its Object. To miſapply thoſe Marks of Dignity, thoſe appropriate enſigns of divine Majeſty; to compliment any *Creature* with them, and thereby to make *common* what God has made *proper*, is to deify the Works of God's Hands, and to ſerve the *Creature* inſtead of the *Creator*, God bleſſed for ever. We have no occaſion to talk of *ſoveraign*, *abſolute*, *ultimate* Prayers, and ſuch other odd Fancies: *Prayer* is an addreſs to God, and does not admit of thoſe novel Diſtinctions. In ſhort then, Here is no Room left for your diſtinguiſhing

guiſhing between *ſoveraign* and *inferior* Adoration. You muſt firſt prove, what you have hitherto preſumed only and taken for granted, that you are at liberty to fix what Meaning and Signification you pleaſe to the Acts of *religious* Worſhip; to make them *high* or *low* at Diſcretion. This you will find a very difficult undertaking. Scripture is before-hand with you; and, to fix it more, the concurring Judgment of the earlieſt and beſt Chriſtian Writers. All *religious* Worſhip is hereby determin'd to be, what you call *abſolute* and *ſoveraign*. *Inferior* or *relative* Worſhip appears now, to be Contradiction in Senſe, as it is novel in Sound; like an *inferior* or *relative* God. To what hath been ſaid, I may add a few farther Conſiderations from Scripture. The Apoſtles *Barnabas* and *Paul*, when the **Lycaonians* would have done *Sacrifice* unto Them, did not tell Them that *Sacrifice* was of *equivocal* Meaning; and that They might proceed in it, provided only that They would rectify their *Intentions*, and *conſider* Them as *Apoſtles* only; but They forbad them to *Sacrifice* to Them at all. The *Angel*, in the *Revelations*, did not direct St. *John* to *conſider* Him only as an *Angel*, and then to go innocently on, in his *Worſhip* of Him; but He order'd Him to *Worſhip* God. Our Bleſſed Lord did not tell the Devil that all external Worſhip was *equivocal*, and might be offered to Angels or Men, provided the *Intention* was

* Act. 14.

regulated, and reſpect *proportion'd*; but He told Him plainly that all *religious* Worſhip was appropriate to God. In fine, nothing is more evident than that the Deſign, both of the Law and the Goſpel, was to eſtabliſh this great Truth, and to Root out *Creature-Worſhip*. " And this was, as Dr. *Cudworth* rightly ob- " ſerves, the grand Reaſon why the Antient " Fathers ſo zealouſly oppoſed *Arianiſm*; be- " cauſe that Chriſtianity, which was intended " by God Almighty for a means to extirpate " *Pagan Idolatry*, was thereby it ſelf *Paga-* " *nized* and *Idolatrized*; and made highly " guilty of that very thing, which is ſo much " condemn'd in the *Pagans*, that is, *Creature-* " *Worſhip*. This might be proved by ſundry " Teſtimonies of *Athanaſius*, *Baſil*, *Gregory* " *Nyſſen*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Epiphanius*, " *Chryſoſtom*, *Hilary*, *Ambroſe*, *Auſtine*, " *Fauſtinus*, and *Cyril* of *Alexandria*; All of " Them charging the *Arians*, as guilty of the " very ſame Idolatry with the *Gentiles*, or " *Pagans*, in giving *religious Worſhip*, even " to the *Word* and *Son of God* Himſelf (and " conſequently to our Saviour Chriſt) as He was " ſuppoſed by Them to be but a *Creature* *.

But, in anſwer perhaps to This, it may be ſaid, by ſuch as run Things off in a confuſed manner and do not ſtay to diſtinguiſh, that certainly there is a wide and great Difference between giving Honour to Heathen Idols, and

* Cudw. Intell. Syſt. p. 628.

doing

doing it to our Saviour Christ, tho' a *Creature* only. No doubt but there is; and God forbid that any Christian should say, or think otherwise. But that is not the point. The Worship even of *Saints* and *Angels* is much preferable to *Pagan* Worship. But still They are Both *equally*, tho' not equally *culpable*, *Idolatry*; and are Breaches of the first Commandment. Whatever love, respect, gratitude, &c. may be due for what our Lord and Saviour has wrought for us, if He be still a *Creature*, All cannot come up to *Worship*, which is appropriate to God alone. Well, but it may be farther pleaded, that here is God's *command* in the Case, which makes it widely different from any of the former. Very True, there is so; and we shall make a proper use of that hereafter: But the Question is, what is the fundamental Rule of *religious* Worship? Is it *to worship God only*? Or is it to worship God, *and whomsoever besides, God shall appoint to be worship'd*? They who pretend the latter, must show some Foundation, if They can, in Scripture, for it. Where is it intimated, either in the Old or New Testament, that Worship should be paid to any besides God? Neither the Law nor the Prophets, neither Christ nor His Apostles ever intimated any thing like it. Our Saviour did not say, worship God, and *whomsoever God shall order to be worship'd*; nor did the Angel, in the Revelations, insinuate any such Thing: St. *Paul* never told us of *serving* the *Creator*, and

whom the Creator ſhould nominate beſides; but *Creator* only. The like may be obſerved upon other occaſions, where this might have been properly intimated, but is conſtantly omitted. Nothing therefore can be plainer than that the fundamental Rule for Worſhip is, that *God only is to be worſhip'd.* All Worſhip, inconſiſtent with this *primary* and perpetual Law, muſt, of Conſequence, appear *Idolatrous*, either in the Practice, or the Principle: And it is thus that the *Arians*, following a *Scripture-Command* but not upon *Scripture-Principles*, and practiſing a *Chriſtian* Duty upon a *Pagan* Foundation of *Creature-Worſhip* and *Polytheiſm*, ſtand charged with Idolatry.

2. To confirm us farther in the Truth of the Principles here aſſerted, I ſhall ſubjoin a ſecond Conſideration, drawn from the Practice of the primitive Martyrs; who may be preſumed to have underſtood the Principles of that Religion, for which They chearfully laid down their Lives. It is well known that They readily ſubmitted to all kinds of Torment, and to Death it ſelf, rather than offer Adoration, Incenſe, or Sacrifice to the Heathen Deities. Now, if *Soveraign* Worſhip be all that is appropriated to God; and if no Worſhip be *Soveraign*, but what the inward *Intention*, and ſecret *Eſteem* of the Worſhipper make ſo; how thoughtleſs were They, to reſiſt even unto Blood, for fear of committing a Sin, which it was not poſſible for Them to have been guilty of. They could never have blunder'd

blunder'd so egregiously, as to have *considered* the Heathen Deities (which They heartily despised) as *Supreme* Gods; or to have *intended* them *Soveraign* Worship; and therefore could not have been guilty of giving them that *Worship* which is appropriate to God. They had so mean and despicable an Opinion of the *Pagan* Deities, that if the Quality of the Worship is to be estimated from the secret *Esteem* and *Intention* of the *Worshiper*, such Acts of Worship must have dwindled into no Worship in reality; hardly amounting to so much as an empty ceremonious Compliment. Where then was the Harm of *Sacrificing* to Idols? What Law had condemn'd it, if your Principles be true? The outward Act being *equivocal*, this could not be interpreted *Sacrifice*, such as God had forbid to be offer'd to any but Himself. But Those primitive Saints were unacquainted with your refined Subtilties, having learned their Logick from Scripture, and the plain common Sense and Reason of Mankind. They knew that the Signification of Worship and Sacrifice depended not on their arbitrary Esteem, or secret Intention; but had been before fix'd and determin'd by God. To offer Sacrifice to the Heathen Deities, was, by Construction and Implication, declaring Them to be *immutable*, *eternal*, *supreme*, and strictly *divine*. They could not be guilty of such a solemn Lie, or commit such barefac'd Profaneſs and Idolatry. They would not prostitute

the Marks and Characters of Divinity to Thoſe who were *by Nature no Gods*; nor give That to Idols, which was appropriated to God only. This was their manner of reaſoning; and this was right: For, indeed, upon the other *Hypotheſis*, there is nothing ſo mean or low, but what a Man might pay *religious* Worſhip to. For Inſtance: Pray to *Angels*, but *conſider* them as *Angels*, with *proportionate* Reſpect, and there will be no harm in it. Worſhip Saints departed, but *intend* them only ſuch reſpect as is due to *Saints*, and all is right. Fall down before a Crucifix with humble Proſtration, but *conſider* it as a *Crucifix*, and *intend* little or nothing by it, and all is well. Theſe ſeem to me the unavoidable Conſequences of this famed Diſtinction; and theſe are the uſes which have actually been made of it, ſince Men have learn'd to be ſubtile, inſtead of wiſe; and have departed from the fundamental Maxim of revealed Religion, that *God alone is to be worſhip'd with religious Worſhip.* The Sum of what hath been ſaid, on this important Article, may be comprized in the following Particulars.

1. That, under the Old Teſtament, all *religious* Worſhip was declared to belong to God only; and upon ſuch Reaſons as exclude all *Creature-Worſhip*; Namely, becauſe He is God, *Jehovah*, Eternal, Immutable; Creator, Preſerver, Suſtainer and Governor of all Things.

2. That

2. That our bleſſed Lord made no Alteration in this Law; but explain'd and confirm'd it: His Apoſtles, after Him, inculcated the ſame Thing, long after our Saviour's *Exaltation* and *Aſcenſion*, and an Angel from Heaven reinforc'd it, thereby proclaiming its perpetual Obligation. No Diſtinction of Worſhip, *mediate* and *ultimate*, was ever intimated; nor of *Inferior* and *Soveraign:* But all *religious* Worſhip ſuppoſed to have one *Meaning*, one *Significancy*, one *Object*, viz. The *divine Nature*; whether ſubſiſting in one Perſon, or more.

3. Such being the Rule and ſtanding Law for *religious* Worſhip, none can have any right, title, or claim to *Worſhip*, but in Conformity to the ſame Rule.

4. If the Son of God be *very* God, *Jehovah*, *Creator*, *Suſtainer*, and *Preſerver* of all Things; then He both may, and ought to be worſhip'd, in conformity to the Scripture-Rule, and upon Scripture-Principles: But if He be a *Creature* only, the worſhip of Him is not conſiſtent with the fundamental Rule both of the Law and the Goſpel. In a word; if the Son of God is to be *worſhip'd*, He is not a *Creature:* if a *Creature*, He is not to be *worſhip'd*.

It remains now only to inquire, whether the primitive Church, which had the ſame Scriptures that we have and better Opportunities of knowing and underſtanding Them, made the ſame or the like Concluſions from Them. It is an Argument of no ſmall Importance; and therefore

I ſhall think it worth the while, to give you a brief Summary of the Sentiments of the earlieſt Chriſtian Writers; and in their own Words, that every impartial Reader may be able to judge for Himſelf.

Juſtin Martyr, giving account of the Chriſtian Worſhip, ſays plainly, " [a] We worſhip " God alone; and, None but God ought to " be worſhip'd.

[b] *Athenagoras*, in like manner, ſpeaks to this effect: " We are not to worſhip the World, " but the *Maker* of it; we worſhip not the " *Powers* of God, but their *Creator* and " *Governor*.

Theophilus ſays, " I will *Honour* the King, " but I will not *Worſhip* Him. [c] I will wor- " ſhip God, the real and true God: no one " ought to be worſhip'd but God alone.

[d] *Tatian*, to the ſame purpoſe, tho' not ſo fully, ſays; " The *Works* of God, made for our " Sakes, I will not worſhip.

[e] *Tertullian* ſays, " What we worſhip is one

a Θεὸν μὲν μόνον προσκυνοῦμεν, Apolog. 1. c. 23. Τὸν Θεὸν μόνον δεῖ προσκυνεῖν, c. 21.

b Οὐ τοῦτον, ἀλλὰ τὸν τεχνίτην αὐτοῦ προσκυνητέον, p. 55. Οὐ τὰς Δυνάμεις (ἢ Θεοῦ) προσιόντες θεραπεύομεν, ἀλλὰ τὸν ποιητὴν αὐτῶν καὶ δεσπότην, p. 56.

c Θεῷ δὲ τῷ ὄντως Θεῷ καὶ ἀληθεῖ προσκυνῶ. —— σὺκ ἄλλῳ ἔξόν ἐστι — προσκυνεῖσθαι ἀλλ' ἢ μόνῳ Θεῷ, p. 30. 33.

d Δημιεργίαν τὴν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεγενημένην χάριν ἡμῶν προσκυνεῖν ἐ θέλω, p. 18. Vid. & p. 79.

e Quod Colimus, Deus unus eſt; qui Totam molem iſtam —— de nihilo expreſſit. *Apol.* c. 17.

Præſcribitur mihi ne quem Alium *Deum* dicam, — ne quem alium adorem, aut quoquo modo venerer, præter unicum Illum qui ita mandat. *Scorp.* c. 4. p. 490. *Rigalt.*

" God,

" God, who made the whole Mass of Things " purely from Nothing. I am commanded not " to call any other, God, nor to *adore*, or in " any wise *worship* any other besides that " one.

* *Clement* of *Alexandria* has more to this purpose: " Angels and Men (says He) are the " Works of God's Hands: Let none of you " worship the *Sun*, but let Him set his Heart " upon the *Sun's Creator:* Neither let Him " deify the World; but to the *Maker of the* " *World* let his Desires be. I seek after God, " the *Creator* of the World, Him that light- " ed up the *Sun*, and not after the *Creatures* " (ἔργα) which God hath made. The *Gentiles* " ought to learn, from the Law and the Pro- " phets, to worship the one God, and Him " only, who is, in reality, Almighty. This " it is to worship the *divine Being* in true " Righteousness of Practice and Knowledge.

† *Irenæus* expresses Himself thus: " You " ought to worship the Lord your God, and to " serve Him only, and to give no credit to

a Ἄγγελοι καὶ Ἄνθρωποι ἔργα τῶν δακτύλων αὐτοῦ —— μὴ τὸν ἥλιόν τις ὑμῶν προσκυνείτω ἀλλὰ τὸν ἡλίου ποιητὴν ἐπιποθείτω. μηδὲ τὸν κόσμον ἐκθειαζέτω, ἀλλὰ τὸν κόσμου δημιουργὸν ἐπιζητησατω, p. 55. Ed. Ox. Τὸν κόσμου δημιουργὸν, τὸν ἡλίου φωταγωγὸν Θεὸν ἐπιζητῶ, οὐ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Θεοῦ, p. 59. Τοὺς Ἕλληνας χρὴ διὰ νόμου, καὶ προφητῶν ἐκμανθάνειν ἕνα μόνον σέβειν Θεὸν τὸν ὄντως ὄντα παντοκράτορα, p. 825. Τὸ δ' ἐστὶ θρησκεύειν τὸ θεῖον διὰ τῶν ὄντως δικαιοσύνης ἔργων τε καὶ γνώσεως, p. 778.

† Dominum Deum tuum adorare oportet, & ipsi soli servire, & non credere ei qui falso promisit ea, quæ non sunt sua, dicens: *Hæc omnia Tibi dabo si procidens adoraveris me.* —— Neque enim conditio sub ejus potestate est, quandoquidem & ipse unus de *Creaturis* est, p. 320. Ed. Bened.

" Him,

" Him, who deceitfully promiſed Things which " were not his own, ſaying: *All theſe Things* " *will I give Thee, if Thou wilt fall down* " *and worſhip me.*——The Syſtem of Creatures " is not under his Dominion, ſince He Him- " ſelf is one of the *Creatures.*

* *Origen* has a great deal to our purpoſe, in his Book againſt *Celſus.* I ſhall ſelect a few Paſſages: He blames the *Gentiles*, " who from " the ſtupendous greatneſs of the World, and " the beautiful order of *Creatures* (δημιουργη- " μάτων) did not perceive that they ought to " admire, worſhip, and adore Him only that " made Them. In another place He ſays: " To worſhip the *Sun* and the *Creatures* of " God (Θεοῦ δημιουργήματα) is forbidden Us, " who are taught, not *to ſerve the Crea-* " *ture beſides the Creator.* He obſerves a little after that: " We ought not to Honour " Thoſe in the place of God, or of the *Son of* " *God.* Which I take notice of here particularly, that you may ſee how clearly *Origen* diſtinguiſhes the Son from the δημιουργήματα Θεοῦ: as, indeed, He does every where. In another place, He obſerves that Chriſtians are bred up

* Οἱ ἐκ τοῦ τηλικούτου μεγέθους τοῦ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, καὶ τοῦ κάλλους τῶν δημιουργημάτων μὴ δυνάμενοι ἀναβλέψαι καὶ θεωρῆσαι, ὅτι προσκυνεῖν καὶ θαυμάζειν καὶ σέβειν χρὴ μόνον τὸν ταῦτα πεποιηκότα, p. 158. ——— σέβειν δὲ τὸν ἥλιον, καὶ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ δημιουργήματα ἅπερ ἡμῖν ἀπηγόρευται διδασκομένοις μὴ λατρεύειν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα, p. 375.

I ſhall add another Paſſage.

Οὐδεὶς γὰρ βλέπων τοῖς τῆς ψυχῆς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἄλλῳ τρόπῳ σέβει τὸ θεῖον παρὰ τὸν ὑποδεικνύντα ἐνορᾶν ἀεὶ τῷ τοῦ παντὸς δημιουργῷ, καὶ πᾶσαν εὐχὴν ἀναφέρειν ἐκείνῳ, p. 367.

to

to Thoughts elevated far * *above all Creatures*, and might very justly disdain to worship any of Them. The like He remarks of the *Jews*, " that they were taught to † ascend up to " the *uncreated Nature* of God, to fix " their Eyes upon Him only; and on Him " alone to rest all their Hopes and Ex- " pectations.

I might add many more Testimonies, to the same effect, from the *Ante-Nicene* Writers: But these are sufficient to give us a just Idea of their Principles, in relation to the Object of Worship. This we shall find run thro' Them all, That God alone is to be worship'd; the *Creator* in opposition to all *Creatures* whatever; the τὸ Θεῖον (as *Clement* of *Alexandria*, and *Origen* sometimes accurately expresses it) which also *Tertullian* seems to intimate, in the words, *Quod Colimus*, above cited. The Sum then of the case is this: If the Son could be included as being *uncreated*, and very God; as *Creator*, *Sustainer*, *Preserver* of all Things, and one with the Father; then He might be worship'd upon their Principles, but otherwise could not. What their Practice was, shall be consider'd, in its proper place. For the present, let it be a

* Τοὺς διδαχθέντας μεγαλοφυῶς ὑπεραναβαίνειν πάντα τὰ δημιουργήματα, &c. p. 237.

† Ἀναβαίνειν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀγένητον τοῦ Θεοῦ φύσιν κακείνῳ μόνῳ ἐνορᾶν, καὶ τὰς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μόνας ἐλπίδας προσδοκᾶν, p. 189.

Compare p. 160. *where* Origen *insists upon the Necessity of elevating our Thoughts and Devotions above and beyond all* created *Being.* ὑ, παντὸς γενητοῦ, *in one place,* παντὸς γενητὸς *in the other.*

Rule

Rule and Maxim with us, fix'd, as far as Scripture and the concurring Judgment of Antiquity can fix it (beſides what might be juſtly pleaded from the Reaſon of the Thing) that no kind or degree of *religious* Worſhip is due, or can be lawfully paid, to any *Creature*. The Concluſion from all is; if our Bleſſed Lord is a *Creature*, He is not to be worſhip'd; if He is to be worſhip'd, He is not a *Creature*. Now we may paſs on.

QUERY XVII.

Whether, notwithſtanding, Worſhip and Adoration be not equally due to Chriſt; and conſequently, whether it muſt not follow that He is the one God, and not (as the Arians *ſuppoſe) a diſtinct inferior Being?*

YOU Anſwer, that *Equality of divine Honour is never attributed in Scripture to the Son with the Father*; and then, in proof of a Matter of Fact, you aſſign a reaſon of your own deviſing; *for then the Son would be abſolutely equal with the Father, which is contrary to Scripture and Reaſon*, (p. 94.) But why do you not keep cloſe to the Words of the Query, and to the point in Queſtion? *Worſhip* and *Adoration* are my Words; not *divine Honour*, which is ambiguous, and leads us off from the Argument in Hand. Suppoſe it had been ſaid *Sacrifice:* Would you anſwer thus?

thus? Equality of *divine Sacrifice* is never attributed, *&c.* Do not you ſee the Impropriety? Well, but, as it is, you muſt ſay, *equality of divine Worſhip* is never attributed, *&c.* And then, pray tell me, what you mean by *equality* or *inequality* of *Worſhip*; whether you mean longer or ſhorter Prayers, more or leſs frequent Addreſſes, or any thing elſe. Be that as it will, *Worſhip*, *religious* Worſhip, greater or ſmaller, longer or ſhorter, has the ſame Import and Significancy; and ſpeaks the Perſon addreſs'd to, to be *divine:* juſt as *Sacrifice*, whether offer'd once a Year only or once a Day, or whether it were a *Lamb* or only two *young Pigeons*, carried the ſame Acknowledgment with it of the *Divinity*, *Soveraignty*, and *Supremacy* of the Perſon to whom it was offer'd. Now, *Worſhip* being, as hath been ſaid, an Acknowledgment of the true God, in oppoſition to all *Creatures* whatever, which are by Nature no Gods; and being offer'd to the Father, not for the recognizing his *perſonal* Properties, as He ſtands diſtinguiſh'd from the *Son* and *Holy Spirit*, but his *eſſential* Perfections, common to all, and by which He is diſtinguiſh'd from the *Creatures*; it is very manifeſt, that if the Son is to be *worſhip'd* too, He is equally God, and true God, with the Father; has all the ſame eſſential Excellencies and Perfections which the Father hath, and is at as great a diſtance from the Creatures; in oppoſition to whom, and as a mark of his Superior

perior and infinitely tranſcendent Excellency, He is *worſhip'd.* If then *Honour* conſiſts in the Acknowledgment of his eſſential Perfections, *Equality of divine Honour is attributed in Scripture to the Son with the Father*; becauſe *Worſhip* is attributed to Both, and is always of the ſame Import and Significancy, by God's own Order and Appointment. But then you'l ſay, the Son will be *abſolutely* equal with the Father; which you think inconſiſtent with Scripture and Reaſon. If you mean by *abſolutely* equal, that the Son muſt be the *firſt Perſon*, as well as the Father, I deny your Inference: if any thing elſe, I allow it to be true. The Son will be *equal* in all thoſe Reſpects, for which Worſhip is due to the Father Himſelf. He will be *equally divine*, equally *eternal*, *immutable*, *wiſe*, *powerful*, &c. in a word, equally *God and Lord.* As to the *Subordination* of Perſons in the ſame Godhead, That is of diſtinct Conſideration; and we may never be able perfectly to comprehend the Relations of the three Perſons, *ad intra*, amongſt themſelves; the ineffable Order and Oeconomy of the ever bleſſed Co-eternal Trinity. You have many Things to ſay, in hopes to leſſen the Honour and Worſhip attributed to the Son in Holy Scripture. But unleſs you cou'd prove that no Worſhip at all is to be paid Him, you prove nothing. However, that I may not ſeem to paſs any thing ſlightly over, I ſhall take the Pains to examine your Exceptions.

As

As to what you say, to weaken the force of *Joh.* 5. 23. the answer to it will properly fall under a distinct Query; which is entirely upon it. You * cite *Phil.* 2. 11. *Joh.* 14. 13. against the *Querist*; as if it was any Question betwixt us, whether God was *glorified in his Son*; or whether the Honour of either did not redound to Both. *It was, you say, the Prayer of Christ to glorify his Father, and the Father only.* But read that part of the Prayer again, and believe your own Eyes, *Joh.* 17. 1. *Father, the Hour is come*, Glorify thy Son, *that thy Son also may glorify Thee.* How familiar, how equally concern'd, as well for his *own*, as his *Father*'s Glory. So again, a little after; *I have glorified Thee on the Earth: I have finished the Work which Thou gavest me to do. And now, O Father, glorify Thou me with thine own self, with the Glory which I had with Thee, before the World was*, Joh. 17. 4, 5. See also, *Joh.* 13. 31, 32. and then tell, me whether it was Christ's design, or desire, that his Father *only* might be *glorified.* How could you miss such plain Things? You go on; *The Father is the object, to which He commands us to direct our Prayers.* What? Will you dispute whether Christ is to be worship'd, or invocated? Consider, I beseech you, *Joh.* 5. 23. mention'd above; Recollect with your self, that He is sometimes distinctly and personally † *invocated. Grace, Mercy, and Peace*, or *Grace*

* P. 90. † Acts 7. 59. 1 Thess. 3. 11. Rom. 10. 13. 1 Cor. 1. 2.

and

and Peace, or *Grace* only, are frequently, in Twenty Places of the New Teſtament *, implored of Him, together with the Father. He is to be worſhip'd and adored, as well as the Father, by Men, by [a] *Angels*, by the [b] *whole Creation*. *Glory and Dominion for ever and ever* are [c] aſcribed to Him, as well as to the Father. This is the Senſe of Scripture: I need not add, it being a thing ſo well known, the Senſe alſo of the earlieſt and beſt Chriſtian Writers, who unanimouſly declare for the Worſhip of Chriſt; and their Practice was conformable thereto. And now, that you may ſee how conſiſtent thoſe good Men were (ſuitably to their ſtrict ſincerity) with Scripture, with Themſelves, and with each other; I ſhall ſtep a little aſide, to ſhow You upon what Principles They might, and did give religious Worſhip to Chriſt.

We have heard *Juſtin Martyr*, before, declaring that *God alone is to be worſhip'd*. Very true: But then He conſtantly teaches us that the Son is *God*; and therefore might conſiſtently ſay, that the Son is to be [d] *worſhip'd*, and, in the Name of the whole Church, "*we* [e] *worſhip Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt.*

* See *Clarke's* Script. Doctr. Ch. 2. Sect. 4.

a Hebr. 1. 6. b Rev. 5. 8.

c 2 Pet. 3. 18. Rev. 5. 13. *See alſo* Rev. 7. 10.

d Προσκυνητὸς, Apol. 1. p. 94. Apol. 2. 35. Ox. Dial. pag. 191. 209. 231. 365. Jebb.

e Ἐκεῖνόν τε, καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ ἦλθόντα —— πνεῦμά τε τὸ προφητικὸν σεβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν. Apol. 1. p. 11.

Athena-

Athenagoras has before intimated that nothing less than the [a] *Creator* of the World is to be *worship'd.* But then He tells us too, that all Things were [b] created by the *Son:* and therefore no wonder if, giving account, to the Emperor, of the God whom the Christians worship'd, He [c] joins the *Son* with the Father.

Theophilus declares, as before seen, for the Worship of God only; and says, the King is not to be worship'd, because *He is not God.* But then, as to the *Son*, He [d] owns Him to be God; and therefore of Consequence must suppose Worship due to Him.

Tatian teaches that God only is to be worship'd; not [e] *Man*, not the *Elements*, not the *Creatures*, δημιουργία. Very good: But the Son who [f] *created* Matter, and is Ἀγγέλων δημιουργὸς, might be worship'd notwithstanding.

Tertullian is so scrupulous, that He says, He will not so much as *call* Any other, God, but the God whom He worship'd, and to whom alone He pronounces all Worship due. But He must certainly include the *Son* in that only God; as every one knows who ever look'd into his Writings: And accordingly He [g] admits the worship of Him.

Clement of *Alexandria*, as we have observ'd above, [h] protests against the Worship of *Crea-*

a *See the passage above*, p. 248. b *See above*, p. 189.
c Θεὸν ἄγοντες τὸν ποιητὴν τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγον, p. 122. d Pag. 130. e Pag. 17, 18. 79. f *See above*, p. 189. g Apolog. c. 21. Ad Uxor. l. 2. c. 6. h P. 249.

tures; and allows no Worſhip but to the Maker and Governor of all Things. But then no Man more [a] expreſs than He, for the *worſhiping* of God the Son. The Reaſon is plain: The Son is [b] *Maker* and *Governor* of the World, and even παντοκράτωρ, according to this excellent Writer.

Irenæus likewiſe, as above cited, gives his Teſtimony for the Worſhip of God only; and againſt the Worſhip of any *Creature*. But the ſame *Irenæus* as conſtantly ſuppoſes the Son to be truly God, and one God with the Father and expreſly [c] exempts Him from the number of *Creatures*; and therefore no wonder if He admits the Son to be [d] *invocated*, as well as the Father.

I ſhall obſerve the like of *Origen*, and then have done; referring the Reader, for the reſt, to the compleat Collection of Teſtimonies lately made by the learned [e] Mr. *Bingham*, with very judicious Reflections upon them.

Origen, as we have ſeen above, declares for the Worſhip of the one God, in oppoſition to all *Creatures*, δημιουργήματα, every thing *created* γένητον. But the good Father had His Thoughts about Him: He clearly diſtinguiſhes the Son from the δημιουργήματα, or *Creatures*; and beſides, expreſly makes Him [f] ἀγένητος, *uncreated*, *immutable*, &c. According to *Origen*, the

a Vid. p. 311. 851. Ed. Oxon. b *See above*, p. 189. 69.
c Vid. p. 153. 243. Ed. Bened.
d Pag. 166. 232. e Origin. Eccl. B. 13. c. 2.
f Contr. Celſ. p. 287. 169, 170.

Crea-

Creator of the Universe, and He only is to be worshipp'd [a], pag. 367. Very well; and look but back to page 308, and there the Son is [b] *Creator of the Universe*. So, in [c] another place, He tells us, we are to worship Him only *who made* (all) *these Things*; and if we inquire farther we shall find, in the same Author, that God the Son [d] *made all Things*, the very words. It is therefore a very clear Case, that *Origen* thought the Son to have the fullest Right and Title to *religious* Worship, the same that the Father Himself had, as being eternal, immutable, Creator and Governor of all Things. And therefore He speaks of his being [e] worship'd *as God*, by the *Magi*; and calls it Εὐσέβειαν, the very same word which He uses, [f] speaking of the Worship due to the Father. In [g] another place, He speaks of the worshiping Father and Son jointly as *one God*, and [h] elsewhere mentions the worship of the Son, in his distinct *personal* Capacity. The Sum then of *Origen*'s Doctrine, as it lies in his Book against *Celsus* (the most valuable of all his Works, and almost

a Τοῦ παντὸς δημιουργός. b Δημιουργὸς τῶνδε ϑ παντός.
c Σέβειν χρὴ μόνον τὸν ταῦτα πεποιηκότα, p. 158.
d Τὸν λόγον πεποιηκέναι πάντα, ὅσα ὁ πατὴρ αὐτῷ ἐνετείλατο, p. 63.
e Pag. 46. f Τὴν εἰς τὸν ϑ ὅλων δημιουργὸν εὐσέβειαν, p. 160.
g Ἕνα οὖν Θεὸν, ὡς ἀποδεδώκαμεν, τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν θεραπεύομεν, p. 386.
h Εὐχέσθω τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, δυναμένῳ αὐτὸν ἱάσασθαι, p. 238. Τὸν ἀξιάγαστον αὐτῶν λόγον ϑ Θεοῦ προσκυνήτομεν, p. 239.

N. B. *Here the Translator (as it is usual with Him to misrepresent such Passages as relate to the Son) renders* Ἀξιάγαστον αὐτῶν, ejus Ministrum. *The Sense is:* Dispenser *of them*, i.e. Prophecies, *just before mention'd.*

the only one to be entirely depended on, as giving the true Senſe of *Origen*, or of the Church in his Time) is contain'd in theſe Particulars.

1. That God the Son, if a *Creature*, or not *Creator*, or not truly *God*, ſhould not be *worſhip'd* at all.

2. That being *truly God*, and *Creator*, &c. He may be worſhip'd; either *jointly* with the Father, as one τὸ Θεῖον, or *diſtinctly*, as *one Perſon* of the Godhead.

3. That tho' He be *God*, and *Creator*; yet the *Father* is ſo *primarily* and *eminently* as *Father*, and *firſt* Perſon; and therefore the diſtinct Worſhip of the Son, conſider'd as a Son, redounds to the Father as the Head and Fountain of all. Hence it is, that, as the Father is *primarily* and *eminently* God, Creator, and Object of Worſhip; ſo alſo all Worſhip, is *primarily* and *eminently* the Father's: And thus it is that I underſtand *Origen*, in a * certain place which has been often miſ-interpreted.

4. That the worſhip of the Son, conſider'd as a Son, is not an *inferior* Worſhip, nor any other than proper *divine* Worſhip; being an acknowledgment of the ſame *divine* Excellencies, and *eſſential* Perfections communicated from Father to Son: And hence it is, that there is ſtill but *one Worſhip*, and *one Object* of

* Δεησόμεθα δὲ καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ λόγου, καὶ ἐντευξόμεθα αὐτῷ, καὶ εὐχαριστήσομεν, καὶ προσευξόμεθα ἢ ἐὰν δυνώμεθα κατακούειν τῆς περὶ προσευχῆς κυριολεξίας καὶ καταχρήσεως, p. 233.

Wor-

Worſhip; as one *God*, one *Creator*, &c. by reaſon of the moſt intimate and ineffable Union of the two Perſons; which *Origen* Himſelf *endeavors to expreſs in the fulleſt and ſtrongeſt Words He could think on.

From what hath been ſaid, we may know what Judgment to make of the Antient *Doxologies*. They ought certainly to be underſtood according to the prevailing Doctrine of the primitive Church. They were different in Form, but had all one Meaning; the ſame which I have ſhown you from the primitive Writers. The *Arians* were the firſt who interpreted ſome of them to ſuch a Senſe, as either favor'd *Creature-Worſhip*, or excluded the Son and Holy-Ghoſt from proper *divine* Worſhip. It was low Artifice to value one ſort of *Doxology* above another, only becauſe more *equivocal*; and to contend for *Antient* Words, in oppoſition to the *Antient* Faith. The *Catholicks* underſtood the ſubtlety of thoſe Men, and very eaſily defeated it: Firſt, by aſſerting the only true and juſt Senſe of Thoſe *Doxologies*, which the *Arians* had wreſted to an Heretical Meaning; and next, by uſing, chiefly, *Doxologies* of another Form; which had been alſo of long ſtand-

* Ἀναβέβηκε δὲ πρὸς τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεὸν, ὁ ἀχίστως καὶ ἀδιαιρέτως, καὶ ἀμερίστως αὐτὸν σέβων διὰ τοῦ προσάγοντος ἐκείνῳ ἡμῶν, τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου καὶ σοφίας, &c. p. 382.

The ſame Thought is thus expreſs'd by Cyrill.

Μήτε διὰ τὸ τιμᾶν τὸν πατέρα νομίζειν, ἕν τι τῶν δημιουργημάτων τὸν ἡμῶν ὑποπτεύσωμεν, ἀλλ' εἷς πατὴρ δι' ἑνὸς ἡμῶν προσκυνείσθω, καὶ μὴ μεριζέσθω ἡ προσκύνησις. Cyril. Catech. 11. p. 143. Oxon.

ing in the Church; and which, being leſs *equivocal*, were leſs liable to be perverted. But the Subject of *Doxologies* being already in better Hands, I ſhall here diſmiſs it, and proceed.

You obſerve, that *it was the conſtant practice of the Apoſtles to pray and give thanks to God, through Jeſus Chriſt*, (p. 91.) Very well; and ſo it is the conſtant Practice of the Church at this Day. What can you infer from thence? That the Father and Son are not equal, or are not to be equally honour'd? Nothing leſs: But, as the Son ſtands to us under the particular Character of *Mediator*, beſides what He is in common with the Father, our Prayers, * *generally*, are to be offer'd rather *through* Him, than *to* Him: yet not forgetting or omitting, for fear of Miſapprehenſion and groſs Miſtakes, to offer Prayers directly to Him, and to join Him with the *Father* in *Doxologies*; as the Antient Church did, and as our own, God be thanked, and other Churches of *Chriſtendom* ſtill continue to do. You add, that *whatever Honour is paid* to the Son, is *commanded, on account of his ineffable relation to God, as the only begotten Son*, &c. But this *ineffable* Relation is not that of a *Creature* to his *Creator*; but of a *Son* to a *Father*, of the ſame Nature with Him. *This* may be ſtiled *ineffable:* the other cannot, in any true or juſt Senſe. If the Son is to be *worſhip'd*, as you ſeem here to allow, it can be on no

* *See* Bull. D. F. p. 121.

other

other Account, but ſuch as is conſiſtent with the Scriptures; on the Account of his being one with the Father, to whom Worſhip belongs; and to whom it is appropriated in oppoſition to *Creatures*, not in oppoſition to Him who is of the ſame Nature with, Co-eſſential to, and Inſeparable from Him. The *Worſhip*, you ſay, *terminates not in the Son.* How this is to be underſtood, and in what Senſe admitted, I have explain'd above. Strictly ſpeaking, no Honour is paid to Either, but what redounds to the Glory of Both; becauſe of their intimate Union; and becauſe Both are but *one God. But* you ſay, *the Father begat Him:* Very well; ſo long as He did not *create* Him, all is ſafe: The *Eternity*, the *Perfections*, the *Glory* of Both, are One. *And*, you ſay, *gave Him dominion over us:* That is more than you can prove; unleſs you underſtand it of Chriſt, conſider'd as *God-Man*, or *Mediator.*

In ſome Senſe, every thing muſt be refer'd to the Father as the firſt Perſon, the Head and Fountain of all. But this does not make two Worſhips, *Supreme* and *Inferior;* being all but one Acknowledgment of one and the ſame eſſential Excellency and Perfection, conſider'd *primarily* in the Father, and *derivatively* in the Son; who, though perſonally diſtinguiſh'd, are in Subſtance undivided and eſſentially one. All your Arguments, on this Head, amount only to a

petitio principii, taking the main Thing for granted; that a *Distinction of Persons* is the same with a *Difference of Nature*; and that a Subordination of the Son, as a Son, to the Father, implies an essential Disparity and Inequality betwixt Them; which you can never make out. Instead of proving the Son to be a *Creature*, and that He is to be worshipp'd notwithstanding (which are the Points you undertake) all that you really prove is, that the *Son* is not the *Father*, or first Person, nor considered as the *first Person* in our Worship of Him; which is very true, but very wide of the purpose. What follows in your Reply, (*p.* 91, 92, 93.) does not need any farther Answer; being either barely Repetition, or Comments on your own Mistake of the meaning of the word, *Individual*; of which enough hath been said before. You are pleased (*pag.* 94.) to make a *wonder* of it, that I should quote *Heb.* 1. 6. in favor of my *Hypothesis*. But if you consider that the Angels are There order'd to *worship* the Son; and that Worship is appropriated to God only, by many Texts of Scripture, and the concurring Sense of Antiquity, as I have shown above; there will be little farther occasion for *wondring*, in so clear a Case. In that very Chapter (*Heb.* 1.) it is sufficiently intimated what it was that made the *Son* capable of receiving Worship and Adoration. He is declared to have *made the Worlds*; to be the *Shining-forth of his Father's Glory, and the express Image*

Image of his Person; and to *uphold all Things by the word of his Power*, (v. 2, 3.) Strong and lively Expressions of his *divine*, *eternal*, *uncreated* Nature; such as might give Him the justest claim to the Worship and Adoration of Men and Angels. In the close, you have a Remark about the error of *Arius*; which, you say, *did not consist in the making the Son*, *distinct from*, *and really subordinate to the Father* (*for that was always the Christian Doctrine.*) Here you come upon us with *general* Terms, and *equivocal* Expressions; Leaving the Reader to apprehend that the Christian Church believed the Son to be a *distinct*, *separate*, *inferior* Being; in short, a *Creature*; as *Arius* plainly, and you *covertly* assert: Whereas there is not an Author, of Reputation, among all the Antients, before *Arius*, that taught or maintain'd any such Thing. A *Subordination*, in some Sense, They held; and that is all; not in *Arius*'s Sense, not in Your's. Well, but you proceed to tell us, wherein his Error consisted, *viz. in presuming to affirm*, *upon the Principles of his own uncertain Philosophy*, *and without warrant from Scripture*, *that the Son was* ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, *and that* ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν. *Arius* had so much *Philosophy*, or rather common Sense, as to think; and so much Frankness and Ingenuity, as to confess; that there neither is, nor can be any *Medium* between *God* and *Creature*. He was not so ridiculous as to imagine that God first

firſt made a *Subſtance*, and then out of that *pre-exiſting created* Subſtance made the Son; Beſides that, even this way, the Son had been, in the laſt reſult, ἐξ ὐκ ὄντων: Nor was He weak enough to believe that any thing, *ad extra*, had been *co-eval*, or *co-eternal* with God Himſelf. If He had, He need not have ſcrupled to have allow'd the like Privilege to the *Son*; the firſt and beſt of all Beings, except God Himſelf, in His Opinion.

But ſince you think your own *Philoſophy* ſo much better than *Arius*'s, will you be ſo kind as to tell us plainly whether the Son be of the *ſame divine Subſtance* with the Father; or of ſome *extraneous* Subſtance which *eternally pre-exiſted*; or from *nothing*. The *firſt* you deny directly, as well as *Arius*; and the *ſecond* alſo, by plain neceſſary Conſequence: And why then ſhould you differ upon the *third*, which is the only one left, and muſt be true, if Both the other be falſe? If *Arius* was raſh in affirming This, He was equally raſh in denying the Son's *Co-eternity* with the Father, and again in denying his *Conſubſtantiality*; and ſo your cenſure of Him recoils inevitably upon your ſelf. Then, for the other Error of *Arius*, in aſſerting that the Son *once was not*; as having been produc'd, or *created*, by the Father; in your way, you correct it thus *: True, the Son was *produc'd*, *brought into exiſtence*, had a *beginning*, and was not, metaphyſically, *eternal*; but yet, for all that, it was an Error, in *Philoſophy*,

* P. 51. 63.

loſophy, for *Arius* to ſay, that *He once was not.* Unhappy *Arius!* deteſted by his *Adverſaries*; and traduced by his own *Friends*, from whom He might reaſonably have expected kinder Uſage. Let me intreat you, hereafter, to be more conſiſtent: Either value and reſpect the Man, as the great Reviver and Reſtorer of *primitive Chriſtianity*; or renounce his Principles, and declare Him a *Heretick*, as We do.

QUERY XVIII.

Whether Worſhip and Adoration, both from Men and Angels, was not due to Him, long before the commencing of his Mediatorial Kingdom, *as He was their Creator and Preſerver* (See Col. 1. 16, 17.) *And whether* that *be not the ſame Title to Adoration which God the Father hath, as Author and Governor of the Univerſe, upon the Doctor's own Principles?*

YOU anſwer, that *tho' the World was created by the Son, yet no Adoration was due to Him upon that Account, either from Angels or from Men; becauſe it was no Act of* Dominion, *and He did it* merely miniſterially (*p.* 94.) *juſt as no Adoration is now due from us to Angels, for the Benefits they convey to us; becauſe they do it merely* inſtrumentally. This is plain dealing; and however I may diſlike the Thing, I commend the

the frankneſs of it. You are very right, upon theſe Principles, in your parallel from Angels: Had the Antients thought the Office of the Son *miniſterial*, in your low Senſe, They would have paid Him no more reſpect than they paid to *Angels*; and would certainly never have *worſhip'd* Him. But I paſs on: *Creation*, you ſay, is *no Act of Dominion*; and therefore is not a ſufficient Foundation for Worſhip. The ſame Reaſon will hold with reſpect to the Father alſo; for, *Creating* is one thing, and *Ruling* another. Yet you'l find that Scripture makes *Creation* the ground and reaſon of Worſhip, in ſo particular and diſtinguiſhing a Manner, that no Perſon whatever, that had not a hand in Creating, has any right or title to Worſhip, upon Scripture-Principles; to which Catholick Antiquity is entirely Conſonant, as we have obſerved above. I did not found his Right of Worſhip on *Creation* only, but *Preſervation* too; referring to Coloſſ. 1. 17. *By Him all Things conſiſt*; to which may be added Heb. 1. 3. *Upholding all Things by the word of his Power.* The Titles of *Creator*, *Preſerver*, *Suſtainer* of all Things ſound very high; and expreſs His ſuper-eminent Greatneſs and Majeſty, as well as Our Dependence; and therefore may ſeem to give Him a full Right and Title to Religious Worſhip; eſpecially if it be conſider'd, that they imply *Dominion*, and cannot be underſtood without it. Beſides that *Creator*, as hath been ſhown, is the Mark, or

Cha-

Characteristick of the true God, to whom all Honour and Worship is due. Add to this, that by *Joh.* 1. 1. the Son was Θεὸς before the Foundation of the World; which implies, at least, *Dominion*, upon your own Principles: And when He came into the World, * He *came unto his own*, (Joh. 1. 11.) having been their *Creator*, *v.* 10. and, as is now explain'd, *Governor* from the first. Wherefore, certainly, He had a just Claim and Title to Adoration and Worship from the Foundation of the World, even upon your own *Hypothesis*. As to his creating *ministerially* only, I have said enough to that Point, under the Eleventh *Query*, whither I refer you.

From what hath been observed, it may appear sufficiently, that the divine Λόγος was our King, and our God long before; that He had the same Claim and Title to religious Worship that the Father Himself had; only not so distinctly reveal'd; and that his Enthronization, after his Resurrection, was nothing more than declaring the Dignity of his Person more solemnly, and investing Him as † *God-Man*, in his

* Unus Deus Pater super Omnes, & Unum verbum Dei quod per omnes, per Quem omnia facta sunt, & quoniam Hic Mundus proprius ipsius, & per Ipsum factus est Voluntate Patris, *&c.* — Mundi enim Factor vere verbum Dei est. *Iren.* p. 315.

Verbum autem Hoc illud est, Quod in sua venit, & sui Eum non receperunt. Mundus enim per Eum factus est, & Mundus Eum non cognovit. *Novat.* c 13. p. 714.

Si Homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo Veniens in hunc Mundum in sua venit, cum Homo nullum fecerit Mundum? p. 715.

† Εἰ δὲ ὑψοῦσθαι λέγεται, καὶ ἐν τάξει χαρίσματος τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα δέχεσθαι, εἰς ἐκεῖνο δηλονότι μετὰ σαρκὸς ἐπανάγεται, εἰς ὅπερ ἦν καὶ δίχα σαρκός, Cyril. Alex. Thes. p. 130.

whole

whole Perſon, with the ſame Power and Authority, which, as God, He always had; and now was to hold in a different Capacity, and with the Addition of a new and ſpecial Title, that of *Redeemer*. * They therefore who endeavor to found the Son's Title to Worſhip, only upon the Powers and Authority of the *Mediator*, or *God-Man*, after the Reſurrection (alledging *Joh.* 5. 22. *Phil.* 2. 10. *Heb.* 1. 6. and the like) give us but a very lean and poor Account of this Matter; neither conſiſtent with Truth, nor indeed with their own *Hypotheſis*. You quote *Phil.* 2. 6. in favour of your Notion; and ſay, that Chriſt *was from the Beginning in the form of God*; *yet He did not aſſume to Himſelf to be honoured like unto God, till after his Humiliation.* But this Poſition can never be made out from that Text. Allowing you your Interpretation, about, *aſſuming to be honour'd*, yet this can mean only, that He did not aſſume, *during his Humiliation*, without any reference to what He had done before. It is very clear from *Joh.* 17. 5. that our bleſſed Saviour was to have no greater Glory after his Exaltation and Aſcenſion, than He had *before the World was. Glorify me, with thine own ſelf, with the Glory, which I had with Thee, before the World was.* His Glory had, to appearance, been under an Eclipſe, during the ſtate of his Humiliation:

* *Clarke's* Script. Doctr. Prop. 48. 50, 51. *Clarke's* Reply, pag. 239.

But

But after that, He was to appear again in full Luſtre; in all the Brightneſs and Splendor of his divine Majeſty, as He had done ever before. You think, that *our Worſhip of Him, in his own diſtinct Perſon and Character, commenc'd after his Reſurrection from the dead.* I might allow this to be ſo in Fact; and yet maintain, that He always had the ſame juſt Right and Title to *religious* Worſhip: which muſt have had its effect, had it been clearly and diſtinctly revealed, ſooner. This is enough for my purpoſe; in as much as I contend only, that the Worſhip due to Him is not founded merely upon the Power and Authority ſuppoſed to have been given Him after his Reſurrection; but upon his *perſonal* Dignity, and *eſſential* Perfections. He might have had the very ſame right and claim all along, that ever He had after; only it could not take effect, and be acknowledged, till it came to be clearly revealed. Thus, God the Father had, undoubtedly, a full Right and Title to the Worſhip and Service of Men, or of Angels, from the firſt: But that Right could not take place before He revealed and made Himſelf known to Them. This, I ſay, is ſufficient to my purpoſe; and all that I inſiſt upon. Yet, becauſe I have a religious Veneration for every Thing which was univerſally taught and believed by the earlieſt Catholick Writers, eſpecially if it has ſome Countenance likewiſe from Scripture; I incline to think that Worſhip, diſtinct Worſhip,

ſhip, was paid to the Son, long before his Incarnation.

Irenæus is * expreſs that the Λόγος was worſhip'd of old, together with the Father. And this muſt have been the Senſe of all thoſe Fathers, before the *Council* of *Nice*, who underſtood and believed that the Perſon who appear'd to the *Patriarchs*, who preſided over the *Jewiſh* Church, gave them the Law, and all along headed and conducted that People, was the ſecond Perſon of the ever bleſſed Trinity. Now, this was the general and unanimous Opinion of the *Ante-Nicene* Writers, as hath been ſhown at large, under *Query* the ſecond. And it is obſervable, that *Euſebius* and *Athanaſius*, (two very conſiderable Men, and thoroughly vers'd in the Writings of the Chriſtians before Them) tho' They were oppoſite as to Party, and differ'd as to Opinion, in ſome Points; yet They † entirely agreed in This, that the Son was *worſhip'd* by *Abraham*, *Moſes*, &c. and the *Jewiſh* Church. And herein, had we no other Writings left, we might reaſonably believe that They ſpake the Senſe of their Predeceſſors, and of the whole Chriſtian Church, as well before, as in their own Times. You will ſay perhaps, that the Worſhip, ſuppoſed to have been then paid to the Son, was not *di-*

* Qui igitur a Prophetis adorabatur Deus Vivus, Hic eſt Vivorum Deus & Verbum Ejus —— l. 4. c. 5. p. 232. Ed. Bened. *See alſo* Novatian. c. 15. Deum & Angelum invocatum.

† Euſeb. E. H. l. 1. c. 2. *See alſo Comm. in* Iſa. p. 381. 386. Athanaſ. Vol. 1. p. 443. 445.

ſtinct

stinct Worship. But it is sufficient that it was (according to the Sense of the Christian Church) paid to the *Person* appearing, the *Person* of the Son, and He did not refuse it; which is the very Argument that * some of the *Ante-Nicene* Writers use in Proof of his Divinity. The *Patriarchs* worship'd that Person, who appear'd and communed with Them; supposing Him to be the God of the Universe, to whom of right all Worship belongs. Had He not been what They took Him for, He should have rejected that Worship, as the † Angel did *Manoah*'s Sacrifice; and as the Angel, in the *Revelations*, rejected the Worship which St. *John* would have offered Him. In a word; since the Son received that Worship, in his *own Person* (according to the Antients) it must be said, He was then *distinctly* worship'd, and in his own Right, as being *truly* God. However That be, my Argument is still good, that the Son (having been in *the Form of God*, and *God*; *Creator*, *Preserver* and *Sustainer* of all Things, from the Beginning) had a Right to Worship, even upon *your* Principles (much more *mine*) long before the commencing of his

* Novatian *may here speak the Sense of all. On* Gen. 31. *He comments thus:* Si Angelus Dei loquitur Hæc ad Jacob, atque Ipse Angelus infert, dicens: Ego sum Deus qui visus sum tibi in loco Dei: non tantummodo Hunc, Angelum, sed & Deum positum, sine ulla hæsitatione conspicimus; Quique *Sibi* votum refert ab Jacob destinatum esse, *&c.* —— Nullius Alterius Angeli potest hic accipi tanta Auctoritas, ut Deum *Se* esse fateatur, & votum *Sibi* factum esse Testetur, nisi tantummodo Christi —— *c.* 27.

† Judges 13. 16.

Mediatorial Kingdom: And therefore his Right and Title to Worſhip was not *founded* upon the *Powers* then ſuppoſed to have been given Him: Conſequently, thoſe Texts which you refer to, for that purpoſe, are not pertinently alledged; nor are they of ſtrength ſufficient to bear all that ſtreſs which you lay upon Them. This Point being ſettled, I might allow you that, in ſome Senſe, *diſtinct* Worſhip commenc'd with the *diſtinct* Title of *Son*, or *Redeemer:* That is, our Bleſſed Lord was then firſt *worſhip'd*, or *commanded* to be worſhip'd by us, under that diſtinct *Title* or *Character*; having before had no other *Title* or *Character* peculiar and *proper* to Himſelf, but only what was * *common* to the Father and Him too. Tho' Father, Son, and Holy-Ghoſt are all jointly concern'd in *Creation*, *Redemption*, and *Sanctification*; yet it may ſeem good to Infinite Wiſdom, for great Ends and Reaſons, to attribute *each* reſpectively to one *Perſon*, rather than Another; ſo that the Father may be *emphatically Creator*, the Son *Redeemer*, the Holy Ghoſt *Sanctifier:* And upon the commencing of theſe Titles reſpectively, the *diſtinct* Worſhip of each (amongſt Men) might accordingly commence alſo. Excellent are the Words

* Sic Deus voluit novare Sacramentum, ut *nove* Unus crederetur per *Filium* & *Spiritum*, ut Coram jam Deus in ſuis propriis *Nominibus* & *Perſonis* cognoſceretur, qui & retro per *Filium* & *Spiritum* prædicatus non intelligebatur. *Tertull. Contr. Prax.* c. 30.

of

of *Bishop *Bull* to this purpose; which I have thrown into the Margin. I shall only add that while you endeavor to found Christ's Right and Title to *worship* solely upon the Powers supposed to be given Him after his Resurrection, you fall much below the Antient *Arians* (whom yet you would be thought to exceed) and are running into the *Socinian* Scheme, not very consistently with your *own*. Thus you seem to be fluctuating and wavering between Two, (at the same time *verbally* condemning Both) *certain* in Nothing, but in opposing the *Catholick* Doctrine; which when you have left, you scarce know where to fix, or how to make your Principles hang together. To explain this a little farther: I *found* the Son's Title to worship upon the *Dignity* of his *Person*; his *creative* Powers declared in *Joh.* 1. and elsewhere; his being Θεὸς from the Beginning; and

* Profecto admiranda mihi videtur divinarum Personarum in Sacrosanctissima *Triade* οἰκονομία, qua Unaquæque Persona *distincto* quasi *Titulo* humanum imprimis genus imperio suo divino obstrinxerit, *Titulo* illi respondente etiam *distincta* uniuscujusque imperii *patefactione*. *Patrem* Colimus sub *Titulo Creatoris* hujus Universi, qui & ab ipsa Mundi *Creatione* hominibus *innotuerit*; *Filium* adoramus sub *Titulo Redemptoris* ac *Servatoris* nostri, cujus idcirco divina gloria atque imperium non nisi post peractum in terris humanæ *Redemptionis* ac *Salutis* negotium fuerit *patefactum*; *Spiritum* denique *Sanctum* veneramur sub *Titulo Paracleti, Illuminatoris*, ac *Sanctificatoris* nostri, cujus adeo divina Majestas demum post descensum ejus in Apostolos primosque Christianos donorum omne genus copiosissima largitione illustrissimum, *clarius emicuerit*. Nimirum tum demum Apostoli, idque ex Christi mandato, Gentes baptizabant in *Plenam atque adunatam Trinitatem* (ut cum *Cypriano* loquar) h. e. in nomine Patris, Filii, & Spiritus Sancti. *Bull. Prim. Trad.* p. 42.

his *preſerving*, and *upholding* all Things (according to *Coloſſ.* 1. 16, 17. and *Heb.* 1.) antecedently to his *mediatorial* Kingdom: You, on the other Hand, *found* it intirely upon the Powers given Him after his Humiliation (alledging ſuch * Texts as theſe, *Matt.* 28. 18. *Joh.* 5. 22, 23. *Phil.* 2. 10, 11. *Rev.* 1. 5, 6. *Rev.* 5. 8, 9, 10.) as if He had no juſt Claim or Title to *worſhip* at all, before that Time: For, tho' you put in the equivocal Word, *diſtinct*, (very ingeniouſly) yet your Meaning really is, and the Tendency of your Argument requires it, that no Worſhip, *diſtinct* or *otherwiſe*, was due to Him, till He received thoſe full Powers. This pretence, I ſay, might come decently and properly from a *Socinian*, or a *Sabellian*, who either makes Creation *Metaphorical*, or interprets ſuch Texts as *Joh.* 1. 1. *Col.* 1. 16, 17. and the like, of the *Reaſon* or *Wiſdom* of the Father, that is, the Father, *indwelling* in the Man Chriſt Jeſus. But in *you* it muſt appear very improper; and very inconſiſtent with your other Principles: Wherefore I muſt again deſire you to be more conſiſtent; and to keep to one conſtant Scheme. Take either *Arian*, *Sabellian*, or *Socinian*, and abide by it; and then I may know what I have to do: But do not pretend to hold Two Schemes, at a time, utterly repugnant to each other.

As to Scripture's ſeeming, in ſome places, to found Chriſt's Title to Worſhip, not ſo much

* *See* Dr. Clarke's *Reply*. p. 239, 249.

upon

upon what He *is in Himſelf*, as upon what He has *done for us*; a very good Reaſon may be given for it, if it be well conſidered by what Springs and Movements moral Agents are actuated, and that we *love* even God Himſelf, with reference to our Selves, * *becauſe He firſt loved us*. *Abſtracted Reaſons* of Eſteem, Honour, and Regard are unaffecting, without a mixture of ſomething *relative* to Us, which our Selves have a near concern in. The *eſſential* Dignity of Chriſt's Perſon is really the Ground and Foundation of Honour, and Eſteem (and conſequently of *Worſhip*, the higheſt Expreſſion of Both) which ought always to bear proportion to the intrinſick Excellency of the Object: But his Offices, *relative* to Us, are the *moving* Reaſons, which principally affect our Wills; and without which we ſhould want the ſtrongeſt Incitement to pay that Honour and Worſhip, which the *eſſential* Excellency of his Perſon demands. Scripture has ſufficiently apprized us of Both, diſcovering at once both his *abſolute*, and *relative* Dignity; that ſo we being inſtructed as well concerning what He is in Himſelf, as what He is in reſpect to Us, might underſtand what Honour *juſtly* belongs to Him, and want no *motive* to pay it accordingly. Add to this, that Chriſt's Office, *relative* to us, naturally leads us back to the *antecedent* Excellency and Perfection of that Perſon, who was able to do ſo great and ſo aſtoniſhing Things

* 1 Joh. 4. 19.

for us: Beſides that it muſt appear in the higheſt Degree probable, that no *Creature* whatever (ſuppoſing Him to have ſuitable Abilities) could have been intruſted with ſo *great* and ſo *endearing* a Charge; ſuch as muſt inevitably draw after it a larger ſhare of our Love, Reſpect, and Eſteem, than ſeems conſiſtent with our Duty to God, and the Rules laid down in Scripture for our Behavior towards the *Creatures*. But enough of this: I proceed.

QUERY XIX.

Whether the Doctor hath not given a very partial Account of Joh. 5. 23. *founding the Honour due to the Son, on this only, that* the Father hath committed all Judgment to the Son; *when the true Reaſon aſſign'd by our Saviour, and illuſtrated by ſeveral Inſtances, is, that the Son doth the ſame Things that the Father doth, hath the ſame Power and Authority of doing what He will; and therefore has a Title to as great Honour, Reverence, and Regard, as the Father Himſelf hath? And it is no Objection to this, that the Son is there ſaid to do* nothing of Himſelf, *or to have all given Him by the Father; ſince it is owned that the Father is the Fountain of All, from whom the Son derives, in an ineffable manner, his Eſſence and Powers ſo as to be one with Him.*

IN

IN Answer to this, you say, *The only Honour due to our Saviour, is plainly supposed by St.* John *to be given Him, upon Account of his being appointed by the Father judge of the World*, p. 96. This is very strange indeed: What? Was there no Honour due to Him on Account of his having been Θεὸς from the Beginning? None for his having *created* the World? None on Account of his being the *only begotten Son*, which St. *John* represents as a Circumstance of exceeding great * Glory? Surely these were Things great enough to demand our Tribute of Honour and Respect; and therefore St. *John* could never mean that He was to be honoured only upon that *single* Account, as being constituted *Judge of all Men.* This could never be the only reason why *all Men should honour the Son even as They honour the Father.* What then did St. *John* mean? Or rather, what did our Blessed Lord mean, whose Words St. *John* recites? He meant what He has said, and what the Words literally import; that the Father (whose Honour had been sufficiently secured under the *Jewish* Dispensation, and could not but be so under the *Christian* also) being as much concern'd for the *Honour* of his *Son*, had been pleased to commit *all Judgment* to Him, for this very end and purpose, that Men might thereby see and know that the Son, as well as the Father, was *Judge of*

* Joh. 1. 14.

all the Earth, and might from thence be convinc'd how reasonable it was, and how highly it concern'd them, to pay all the same Honour to the Son, which they had hitherto believed to belong to the Father only. And considering how apt Mankind would be to lessen the Dignity of the Son (whether out of a vein of disputing, or because He had condescended to become Man like Themselves) and considering also that the many Notices of the *Divinity* of his Person might not be sufficient, with some, to raise in Them that Esteem, Reverence, and Regard for Him, which They ought to have; for the more effectually securing a point of this high Concernment, it pleased the Father to leave the final Judgment of the great Day in the Hands of his Son: Men therefore might consider that this Person, whom they were too apt to disregard, was not only their *Creator*, and *Lord*, and *God*, but their *Judge* too, before whose awful Tribunal they must one Day appear: An awakening Consideration, such as might not only convince Them of his exceeding Excellency and Super-eminent Perfections, but might remind them also, how much it was their Interest, as well as Duty, to pay Him all that Honour, Adoration, and Service, which the Dignity and Majesty of his Person demands.

Let us but suppose the present Catholick Doctrine of the Co-equality and Co-eternity of the three Persons to be true, what more proper method can we imagine, to secure to each Per-

son

son the Honour due unto Him, than this; that every Person should be manifested to us under some peculiar Title or Character, and inforce his claim of Homage by some remarkable Dispensation, such as may be apt to raise in Us a religious Awe and Veneration? This is the Case in fact; and on this Account, chiefly, it seems to be that the Son, rather than the Father (whose personal Dignity is less liable to be question'd) is to be Judge of all Men, that *so all Men may honour the Son*, καθὼς πιμῶσι τὸν πατέρα. The learned Doctor * pleads that καθὼς often signifies a *general Similitude* only, not an *exact Equality:* Which is very true; and would be pertinent, if we built our Argument on the critical Meaning of the Particle. But what we insist on, is, that our Blessed Lord, in that Chapter, draws a *parallel* between the *Father* and *Himself*, between the *Father*'s Works and his *own*, founding thereupon his Title to Honour; which sufficiently intimates what καθὼς means; especially if it be consider'd that this was in answer to the Charge of making Himself † *equal with God*. This is what I intimated in the Query; upon the reading whereof, you are struck with *amazement at so evident an instance, how prejudice blinds the Minds*, &c. But let me perswade you to forbear that way of talking, which (besides that it is taking for granted the main Thing in Question, presuming that all the Prejudice lies on

* *Reply*, p. 260. † Joh. 5. 18.

one

one ſide, and all the Reaſon on the other) is really not very becoming, in this Caſe, conſidering how many wiſe, great, and good Men, how many Churches of the Saints, through a long Succeſſion of Ages, you muſt, at the ſame time, charge with *prejudice* and *blindneſs*; and that too after much canvaſſing and careful conſidering what Objections could be made againſt Them; to which you add nothing new, nor ſo much as repreſent the old ones with greater Force than They have been often before, 1300 Years ago. It might here be ſufficient, for you, modeſtly to offer your Reaſons: And however convincing they may appear to you (yet conſidering that to Men of equal Senſe, Learning, and Integrity, they have appeared much otherwiſe) to ſuſpect your own Judgment; or, at leaſt, to believe that there may be Reaſons, which you do not ſee, for the contrary Opinion. Well, but after your ſo great Aſſurance, let us hear what you have to ſay. *If our Lord had purpoſely deſign'd, in the moſt expreſs and emphatical Manner, to declare his real Subordination and Dependence on the Father, He could not have done it more fully and clearly than He hath in this whole Chapter.* Yes, ſure He might: Being charged with *Blaſphemy*, in making Himſelf *equal* with God, He might have expreſs'd his Abhorrence of ſuch a Thought; and have told Them that He pretended to be nothing more than a *Creature* of God's, ſent upon God's Errand;

Errand; and that it was not by his *own Power* or *Holineſs*, that *He made the lame Man to walk*, (ſee *Act.* 3. 12.) Such an Apology as this would have effectually took off all farther Suſpicion, and might perhaps have well become a *Creature*, when charg'd with *Blaſphemy*, who had a true Reſpect for the Honour of his *Creator*. But, inſtead of this, He goes on, a ſecond Time, to call Himſelf *Son of God*, v. 25. declaring farther, that there was ſo perfect a Union and Intimacy between the Father and Himſelf, that He was able to do any thing which the Father did; had not only the ſame Right and Authority to work on the *Sabbath*, but the ſame Power of giving Life to whom He pleaſed, of raiſing the Dead, and judging the World; and therefore the ſame Right and Title to the ſame Honour and Regard: and that the Execution of thoſe Powers was lodged in his Hands particularly, leaſt the World ſhould not be ſufficiently apprehenſive of his high Worth, Eminency, and Dignity; or ſhould not *honour the Son even as they honour the Father*.

This is the obvious natural Conſtruction of the whole Paſſage: You have ſome Pretences againſt it, which have been examin'd and confuted long ago by *Hilary*, *Chryſoſtom*, *Cyril*, *Auſtin*, and other venerable Fathers of the Chriſtian Church; ſo that I have little more to do, than to repeat the Anſwers. *The Jews*, you ſay, *falſely* and *maliciouſly* charged Him with making Himſelf equal with God. So ſaid the

the *Arians*: But what ground had either They, or You, for saying so? It does not appear that the *Evangelist* barely repeated what the *Jews* had said: But He gives the Reasons why the *Jews* sought to kill Him; namely, because He *had broke the Sabbath*, and because He *made Himself equal with God*. So thought * *Hilary*; and He is followed therein by Others, whom you may find mention'd in † *Petavius*. And this ‡ *Socinus* himself was so sensible of, that He could not but allow that the *Apostle*, as well as the *Jews*, understood that our Blessed Lord had declared Himself *equal* to God; only He is forced to explain away the *equality* to a Sense foreign to the Context.

But supposing that the Apostle only repeated what the *Jews* had charged Him with; how does it appear that the charge was false? It is not to be denied that He had *really* wrought on the Sabbath, and had *really* called God *his Father*, and in a Sense *peculiar*; and why should not the rest of the Charge be as true as the other? The Context and Reason of the Thing seem very much to favor it: His say-

* Non nunc, ut in Cæteris solet, Judæorum Sermo ab his dictus refertur. Expositio potius hæc Evangelistæ est, Causam demonstrantis cur Dominum interficere vellent. *Hil. Trin.* l. 7. p. 935.

† De Trin. *p.* 152.

‡ Ex modo loquendi quo usus est Evangelista, sentiam eum omnino una cum Judæis censuisse Christum, verbis illis, se æqualem Deo fecisse —— necesse sit intelligere Hoc ipsum *Eum* quoque sensisse, non minus quam senserit Christum appellasse Deum *Patrem suum*, quod ab ipso, uno & eodem verborum Contextu, proxime dictum fuerat. *Socin. Resp.* ad *Vujek.* p. 577.

ing,

ing, *my Father worketh hitherto, and I work*, muſt imply, either that He had an equal Right to do any thing his Father did; or, that He was ſo intimately united to Him, that He could not but act in concert with Him: Which is farther confirm'd by what follows, *v.* 19. *What things ſoever He doth, theſe alſo doth the Son likewiſe.* Beſides, that had this been only a malicious Suggeſtion, a falſe Charge of the *Jews*, the *Evangeliſt*, very probably, would have given Intimation of it, as we find done in other Caſes of that Nature, (*Joh.* 2. 21. *Matt.* 16. 12.) This is the Subſtance of St. *Chryſoſtom*'s reaſoning, in Anſwer to your firſt Objection; and I am the more confirm'd in its being true and right, by obſerving, as before ſaid, that *Socinus* himſelf, a Man ſo much prejudic'd on the other ſide, could not help falling in with the ſame way of Thinking, ſo far, as to believe that the *Apoſtle* and the *Jews* both agreed in the ſame Thing, *viz.* that our Lord did, by what He had ſaid, make Himſelf *equal with God*, in ſome Senſe or other; ſuch as the *Jews* thought to be *Blaſphemy*, and in Conſequence whereof, they would have *kill'd*, i. e. *ſtoned* Him. Another Exception you make from the Words, *The Son can do nothing of Himſelf:* The obvious meaning of which is; that being ſo nearly and cloſely related to God, as a *Son* is to a *Father*; the *Jews* might depend upon it, that whatever He did, was both agreeable to, and concerted with his Father; and

ought

ought to be received with the ſame Reverence and Regard, as if the Father Himſelf had done it. He, as a *Son*, being perfectly one with his Father, could do nothing ἐναντίον τῷ πατρὶ, *againſt his Father*, nothing ἀλλότριον, nothing ξένον, (as *Chryſoſtom* expreſſeth it) Both having the ſame Nature; and harmoniouſly uniting always in *Operation* and *Energy*. Hence it was, that, if one *wrought*, the other muſt *work* too; if one did any thing, the other ſhould do *likewiſe*; if one *quickned* whom He would, ſo ſhould the other alſo; and if one had *Life in himſelf* (or the *Power of raiſing* the *Dead*) ſo ſhould the other have too: And if the Father was primarily *Judge of the World*, in right of his Prerogative as *Father*, the Son ſhould have it in the *Exerciſe* and *Execution*, to manifeſt the Equality. Now, here is no ſtraining nor forcing of Texts, but the literal, obvious, natural Interpretation. But the Interpretation, which you give, is plainly forc'd, makes the Context incoherent, and the whole Paſſage inconſiſtent. For, be pleas'd to obſerve your Senſe of verſe the 19th The Son can do nothing but by *Commiſſion* from the Father: Why? then follows, *For what things ſoever He doth, theſe alſo doth the Son likewiſe.* Does it follow, becauſe He *can do nothing of Himſelf*, in your Senſe, that therefore He can do every thing which the Father does? Where is the Senſe, or Connexion? Is He here limiting, and leſſening his own Powers, as, upon your

your Principles, He should have done in answer to the Charge of Blasphemy? No; but He extends them to the utmost; and, instead of retracting, goes on in the same strain, and says more than He had said before. To make good Sense and Coherence of the Passage, upon your Scheme, you must fill up the Deficiency thus. The Son can do nothing but by Commission; *and Commission He has*, to do every thing that the Father doth. Which, tho' it sounds harsh, and looks too familiar for a *Creature* to pretend, yet might make the Context coherent. However, since the Interpretation I have before given, is more natural and more obvious, argues no deficiency in the Text, makes the whole coherent, and has nothing harsh or disagreeing it, it ought to be prefer'd. For, after all, it must be thought very odd and strange for a *Creature* to be *commission'd* or empower'd to do *all Things* that the *Creator* doth; and to do them ὁμοίως, in the *same manner*, also. I do not make any forced Construction; for so the 20th verse, immediately following, interprets it: *for the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth Him* all Things *that Himself doth*. You endeavor indeed to make some Advantage of this very Text; alledging that *this Power, which the Son exercis'd, was given Him, not by* Necessity (*which is no Gift*) *but by* free Love. But why must *love* imply freedom? Doth not God *love* Himself? And if the Love of Himself be no matter of Choice, why must

muſt the Love of his Son, his *other Self*, be repreſented otherwiſe? You are forc'd to *add* to the Text, to give ſome colour to your Argument; and to call it *free* Love, when the Text ſays only, that the Father *loveth*.

Thus far I have endeavor'd to clear up the Senſe of St. *John*; and to vindicate it from your Exceptions: which are not of ſo great Weight, that you need be *amazed* at any Man's thinking ſlightly of them. *Hilary* well obſerves that the drift and deſign of our Saviour's Words was to declare his *Equality* of Nature with the Father, and his *Sonſhip*, at the ſame Time. * No *inferior* Nature could be capable of *having all Things*; nor could a *Son* have them but as *communicated*. So that, in Both parts, it is directly oppoſite to ſuch as either diſown an *Equality* of Nature, or a *real* Diſtinction; wherefore *Hilary* concludes triumphantly, both againſt *Arians* and *Sabellians*, in Words very remarkable, which I ſhall throw into the † Margin.

But you add, as a Recapitulation of what you had ſaid upon this Article: *If therefore to be freely ſent, and to act in the Name and by the Authority of another, be, to aſſume an*

* Omnia habere ſola natura poſſit indifferens; neque Nativitas aliquid habere poſſit, niſi datum ſit, *p.* 928.

† Concluſa ſunt omnia adverſum Hæretici Furoris Ingenia. *Filius* eſt, quia ab ſe nihil poteſt. *Deus* eſt, quia quæcunque Pater facit, & ipſe Eadem facit. Unum ſunt, quia exæquatur in Honore, Eademque facit non alia. Non eſt Pater, quia miſſus eſt, *p.* 929.

He has more to the ſame purpoſe, p. 1015. 1251.

equality

equality of Honour and Regard with that other, by whom He was ſent; we muſt for ever deſpair to underſtand the meaning of Words, or to be able to diſtinguiſh between a delegated, and a ſupreme underived Power, (*p.* 97.) To which I make anſwer: If declaring Himſelf to be the *proper Son* of That Other, which both the *Jews* and the *Apoſtle* underſtood to be the ſame with making Himſelf *equal* with Him: If his claiming to Himſelf the ſame Right, Power, and Authority which the Other hath; and aſſerting that He is able to do whatever the Other doth; and that the *exerciſe* of thoſe Powers is left to Him, for this very end and purpoſe, that all Men may honour the One even as they honour the Other: If this be not aſſuming an Equality of Honour and Regard with That Other; we muſt for ever deſpair to underſtand the meaning of Words, or to be able to diſtinguiſh between what is proper to a *Creature*, and what to the *Creator only*.

As to what you hint concerning a *delegated* Power, it is not to your purpoſe; unleſs you could prove that one Perſon cannot be *Delegate* to Another, without being unequal, in *nature*, to Him; which would prove that one Man cannot be *Delegate* to another Man; beſides other Abſurdities. Acting by a *delegated* Power does by no means infer any *Inferiority* of *Nature*, but rather the quite contrary; eſpecially, if the Charge be ſuch, as no *inferior Nature* could be able to ſuſtain; or if the Honour at-

tending it, or consequent upon it, be too great for an *inferior Nature* to receive; as the Case is here. However, the divine Administration, and wonderful οἰκονομία of the Three Persons, with their Order of Acting, is what we must not presume perfectly to understand; Nor can any certain Argument be drawn against the Thing, from our imperfect and inadequate Conceptions of it.

If it be objected that there is a *Supremacy* of *Order* lodged in One more than in the Other; let that be rightly understood, and I shall not gainsay it. The Father, as *Father*, is *supreme*; and the Son, as *Son*, *subordinate*. We pretend not to make the Son the *First*, but the *Second* Person of the Godhead. Whatever inequality of Honour such a *Supremacy* of One, and *Subordination* of the Other necessarily imply, while the *Nature* or *Essence* is supposed *equal*, it may be admitted: But, I am not apprized that they infer any; Because, tho' there are two Persons, there is but one * *undivided*

* Unius autem Substantiæ, & Unius Status, & *Unius Potestatis*, quia unus Deus. *Tertull. Contr. Prax.* c. 2. *Unius Divinitatis* Pater & Filius & Spiritus Sanctus. *Id. de Pud.* c. 21.

Ἑνὶ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ τῷ παρ' αὐτῷ λόγῳ ᾧ νοερμένῳ ἀμερίστῳ πάντα ὑποτέτακται. Athenag. leg. c. 15. p. 64.

Unam & Eandem Omnipotentiam Patris ac Filii esse cognoscas; sicut unus atque Idem est cum Patre Deus & Dominus. *Orig.* περὶ Ἀρχ. l. 1. c. 2.

Οὐ γὰρ ἄλλῳ δέξεω πατὴρ, καὶ ἄλλῳ ὑὸς ἔχει, ἀλλὰ μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτήν. Cyrill. Catech. 6. p. 77. Ed. Ox.

Ὁ ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸ πατέρα ἔχων, πῶπων περιέχει τὴν πατρικὴν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν. ὁ δὲ ὅλον ἔχων (πατέρα) καὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν αὐτοῦ πάντως ἔχει. Greg. Nyss. Contr. Eunom. *l.* 1. *p.* 14.

Nature;

Nature; which makes the Caſe widely different from that of one Man (a diſtinct and *ſeparate* Being) acting under Another.

What follows, of your Anſwer to the preſent Query, is only ringing Changes upon the old Objection, drawn from your imaginary Senſe of *individual Subſtance*. And here you let your Thoughts rove, and abound much in Flight and Fancy; conceiving of the *Trinity*, after the manner of Bodies, and reaſoning from corporeal and ſenſible Images. A blind Man would thus take his Notion of Colours, perhaps from his *Hearing* or *Feeling*; and make many fanciful Demonſtrations againſt the *Doctrine* of *Viſion*; which would all vaniſh, upon the opening of his Eyes. Were we as able to judge of what may, or may not be, in relation to the *Modus* of the divine Exiſtence, as we are to judge of common Matters, lying within the Sphere of our Capacity, there might then be ſome force in the Objections made againſt the Doctrine of the Trinity from natural Reaſon: But ſince many Things, eſpecially thoſe relating

Totum Pater, Totum poſſidet Filius: Unius eſt quod Amborum eſt; quod unus poſſidet Singulorum eſt; Domino ipſe dicente: *Omnia quæcunque habet Pater, mea ſunt*; quia Pater in Filio, & Filius manet in Patre. Cui, *Affectu* non *Conditione, Charitate* non *Neceſſitate*, decore ſubjicitur, per Quem Pater Semper honoratur. Denique inquit: *Ego & Pater unum ſumus*. Unde non *diminutiva*, ſed *Religioſa*, ut dixi, ſubjectione eſt Filius Patri ſubjectus: cum Originalis perpetuique Regni una Poſſeſſio, Co-æternitatis Omnipotentiæque una Subſtantia, una Æqualitas, una virtus Majeſtatis auguſtæ, unito in lumine una dignitas retinetur. *Zen. Veronenſ. cit. a Bull. D. F. p. 166.*

to the incomprehenſible Nature of God, may be true, tho' we cannot conceive How; and it may be only our Ignorance, which occaſions ſome appearing Inconſiſtencies; we dare not reject a Doctrine ſo well ſupported by Scripture and Antiquity, upon ſo precarious a Foundation as this; That *Human Underſtanding is the meaſure of all Truth:* Which is what all Objections of that kind, at length, reſolve into.

This being premis'd, let us next proceed to examine your Pretences, that I may not ſeem to neglect any thing you have, that but looks like reaſoning. The *Query* had intimated, that the Son *derives* his Eſſence and Power, in a manner *ineffable.* Againſt which you object thus: *But is it not Self-evident that, let the* manner *of the Son's Generation or Derivation be ever ſo* ineffable, *if* any Thing *was generated, or derived, it muſt be a* diſtinct *individual Subſtance?* No; but we think it ſufficient to ſay, that it muſt be a diſtinct individual *Perſon.* All the difficulty here lies in fixing and determining the Senſe of the words *individual Subſtance.* Would you but pleaſe to define the Terms, we ſhould ſoon ſee what we have to do. But you go on: *It could not be part of the Father's Subſtance; That is abſurd: And to ſay, it was the whole, is ſo flagrant a Contradiction, that I queſtion whether there can be a greater in the nature and reaſon of Things. Can the ſame* individual *Subſtance be* derived,

derived, *and* underived? *Or, can there be a* Communication, *and* nothing communicated? *For, it is supposed, that the* whole *Essence,* or *Substance, is* communicated *to the* Son, *and yet remains* whole *and* uncommunicated, *in the* Father; *which is evidently* to be, *and,* not to be, *at the same Time.* This is your reasoning, founded only on your mistake and misapprehension: By *Father*'s *Substance*, as it seems, you understand the Father's *Hypostasis*, or *Person*; and are proving, very elaborately, that the Father never communicated his own *Hypostasis*, or *Person*, either *in whole*, or in *part*. You should first have shown us what Body of Men, or what * single Man, ever taught that Doctrine, which you take so much Pains to confute. Let me now propose a difficulty much of the same kind, and nearly in the same Words, to you; only to convince you that Objections of this Nature are not peculiar to the Doctrine of the Trinity, but affect other points likewise, whose Truth or Certainty you make no manner of doubt of. What I mean to instance in, is God's *omnipresence:* That, God, the same *individual* God, is every where, you'l readily allow; and also that the *Substance* of God, is God. Now, will you please to tell me, whether that *divine Substance* which fills Heaven, be the same *individual* Substance with That which filleth all Things. If it be not

* *As to your gird upon* Tertullian, *in your Notes, I refer you to* Bull. D. F. p. 95. *for an Answer.*

the *ſame individual Subſtance* (as by your reaſoning it cannot) it remains only that it be *ſpecifically* the ſame; and then the Conſequence is, that you make not one Subſtance *in number*, but *many*; the very thing which you charge the Doctrine of the Trinity with. But farther, the *divine* Subſtance is in Heaven; that is without Queſtion: Now, I ask, whether the *Subſtance* which fills Heaven, be *part* only of that Subſtance, or the *whole*. If it be *part* only, then God is not in Heaven, but a *part* of God only; and the Attributes belonging to the whole Subſtance, cannot all be contracted into any one *part*, without defrauding the other *parts*; and therefore there can be only *part* of infinite Power, *part* of infinite Wiſdom, *part* of infinite Knowledge, and ſo for any other Attribute. For if you ſay, that the *whole* infinite Wiſdom, Power, *&c.* reſiding in the *whole*, is *common* to every part, *it is* (to uſe your own Words) *ſo flagrant a Contradiction, that I queſtion whether there can be a greater in the nature and reaſon of Things.* Can the ſame *individual* Power, Wiſdom, *&c.* be communicated, and not communicated? Or, *can there be a Communication and nothing communicated*? For, it is ſuppoſed that the whole *Wiſdom*, *Power*, &c. is communicated, to one particular part; and yet remains *whole* and uncommunicated in the other parts; *which is evidently* to be, *and* not to be *at the ſame Time.* If you tell me, that *part*

and

and *whole* are not properly applied to *Wisdom*, *Power*, &c. I shall tell you again, that They are (for any thing You, or I know) as *properly* applied to the *Attributes*, as they are to the *Subject*; and belong to Both, or Neither. And since you are pleased to talk of *parts* and *whole* of God's Substance, of which you know little; give me leave to talk in the same way, where I know as little. The Learned Doctor represents it as a great *Solecism* to speak of an * *Ell*, or a *Mile* of *Consciousness*. He may be right in his Observation: But the natural Consequence deducible from it, is, that *Thought* is not compatible with an *extended* Subject: For there is nothing more unintelligible, or, seemingly at least, more repugnant, than *unextended* Attributes in a Subject *extended:* And many may think that an *Ell*, or a *Mile* of God (which is the Doctor's Notion) is as great a *Solecism* as the other. Perhaps, after all, it would be best for Both of us to be silent, where we have really nothing to say: But as you have begun, I must go on with the Argument, about the *Omnipresence*, a little farther. Well, if it cannot be *part* only of the divine Substance, which is in Heaven, since *God* is There, and since all the Perfections and Attributes of the Deity have There their full exercise; let us say that the *whole* divine Substance is there. But then how can He be omnipresent? Can the same *individual* Substance be *confin'd*, and *unconfined*? Or can there be a *diffusion* of it

* *Cl. Lett.* p. 40.

every where, and yet *nothing diffuſed*? For it is ſuppoſed that the whole Eſſence or Subſtance is diffuſed all over the Univerſe, and yet remains whole and undiffuſed in Heaven. Which, again, *is evidently* to be, *and* not to be, *at the ſame time.*

I ſhould hardly forgive my ſelf, upon any other occaſion, ſuch trifling in ſerious Things. If you take to this kind of *reaſoning*, (which is really not *reaſoning*, but running riot with *Fancy* and *Imagination*) about Matters infinitely ſurpaſſing human Comprehenſion; you will make lamentable work of it. You may go on, till you reaſon, in a manner, God out of his Attributes, and your ſelf out of your Faith; and not know at laſt, where to ſtop. For, indeed, all Arguments, of this kind, are as ſtrong for *Atheiſm*, as They are againſt a *Trinity:* Wherefore it concerns you ſeriouſly to reflect, what you are doing. This, and the like Conſiderations have made the wiſeſt and cooleſt Men very cautious how they liſten'd to the rovings of wanton Thought, in Matters above Human Comprehenſion. The pretended Contradictions, now revived by many, againſt the Doctrine of the Trinity, are very old and trite. They were long ago objected to the Chriſtians, by the Heathen Idolaters. They almoſt turn'd the Heads of *Praxeas*, *Noetus*, *Sabellius*, *Manichæus*, *Paul* of *Samoſata*; not to mention *Arius*, *Neſtorius*, *Eutyches*, and other Antient Hereticks. The *Catholicks* were

were ſenſible of them; But having well conſider'd them, They found them of much too ſlight Moment, to bear up againſt the united Force of Scripture and Tradition. The Doctrine of the Trinity, with all its ſeeming Contradictions, has ſtood the Teſt, not only of what Human Wit could do, by way of Diſpute; but of all that Rage and Malice could contrive, through a Perſecution almoſt as Bitter and Virulent, as any that had ever been under Heathen Emperors. This is to me an additional Confirmation, that the Doctrine we profeſs is no ſuch groſs Impoſition upon the common Senſe and Reaſon of Mankind, as is pretended. It was neither Force, nor Intereſt, that brought it in; nor that hath ſince, ſo univerſally, upheld it: And Men are not generally ſuch Idiots as to love Contradictions and Repugnancies, only for Humor or Wantonneſs, when Truth and Conſiſtency are much better, and may be had at as eaſy a rate. Theſe Reflections have carried me rather too far: But They may have their uſe among ſuch Readers as know little of the Hiſtory of this Controverſy; or how long It had been buried; till it pleas'd ſome amongſt Us to call it up again, and to dreſs it out with much Art and *Fineſſe*; to take the Populace, and to beguile the *Engliſh* Reader. Many Things have fallen under this *Query*, which properly belong'd not to it. But it was neceſſary for Me to purſue You, what way ſoever You ſhould take. You was more at Liberty: My Method is determin'd by Your's.

QUERY

QUERY XX.

Whether the Doctor need have cited 300 *Texts, wide of the purpose, to prove what no Body denies, namely,* a Subordination, *in some Sense, of the* Son *to the* Father; *could He have found but one plain Text against His* Eternity *or* Consubstantiality, *the Points in Question?*

YOUR Answer to this is very short, not to say negligent. You say, *if the Doctor's* 300 *Texts prove a real Subordination, and not in name only, the point is gain'd against the Querist's Notion of* Individual Consubstantiality; *unless the same individual intelligent Substance can be Subordinate to it self, and Consubstantial with it self.* Here you are again Doubling upon the word, *Individual.* The *Querist* never had such a Notion as that of *personal Consubstantiality*, which is Ridiculous in the Sound, and Contradiction in Sense; and yet you are constantly putting this upon the *Querist*, and honouring Him with your own Presumptions. Let me again show you, how unfair and disingenuous this Method is. Do not you say that the same *individual Substance* is present in Heaven, and, at the same time, filleth all Things? That it *pervades* the Sun, and, at the same time, *pene-*

* *Clarke's* Reply, p. 7.

trates

trates the Moon also? I might as reasonably argue that you, by such Positions, make the *same individual Substance* greater and less than *it self*, remote and distant from *it self*, higher and lower than *it self*, to the right and to the left of *it self*, containing and contain'd, bounded and unbounded, *&c.* as you can pretend to draw those odd surprizing Consequences upon the *Querist*. Would not you tell me, in answer, that I misinterpreted your Sense of *individual*, and took advantage of an ambiguous Expression? Let the same Answer serve for Us; and you may hereafter spare your Readers the diversion of all that unmanly trifling with an *equivocal* Word. But enough of this Matter. I might have expected of you, in your Reply to this Query, one Text or two to disprove the Son's *Eternity*, and *Consubstantiality*, and to supply the Deficiency of the Doctor's Treatise: But since you have not thought fit to favor me with any, I must still believe that the Doctor's 300 Texts, tho' very wide of the purpose, are all we are to expect; being design'd, instead of *real* Proof, to carry some Show and Appearance of it, that they may seem to make up in Number, what they want in Weight. All that the learned Doctor proves by his 300 Texts, or more, is only that the Son is *Subordinate* to the Father: Whether as a *Son*, or as a *Creature*, appears not. However, the *tacite* Conclusion which the Doctor draws from it, and insinuates carefully to his Reader, is, that the

Son

Son is not ſtrictly and *eſſentially* God; but a *Creature* only. This Inference we deny utterly; alledging that a *Subordination* may be, and may be underſtood, between two Perſons, without the Suppoſition of any *Inferiority* of *Nature:* But all the Anſwer we can get to this is, that * *Nature* and *Eſſence* are *obſcure Metaphyſical* Notions (which is neither true, nor to the purpoſe, nor conſiſtently pleaded by one who builds ſo much upon *Self-exiſtence*, a *Metaphyſical* Term, the word *Equivocal*, and the *Notion* ſufficiently *obſcure*.) And thus, as ſoon as the learned Doctor comes up to the pinch of the Queſtion, not being willing to own the Force of what is urged, He very wiſely diſſembles it, and goes off in a miſt of Words.

I cannot but take notice, upon this occaſion, of your charging us frequently, in an invidious Manner, with the uſe we make of *Metaphyſical* Terms. I know no reaſon you have for it, except it be to anticipate the Charge, as being conſcious to your ſelves how notoriouſly you offend in this kind. Any Man, that is acquainted with the Hiſtory of *Arianiſm*, knows that its main Strength lay in *Logical* and *Metaphyſical* Subtilties. The Faith of the Church was at firſt, and might be ſtill, a plain, eaſy, ſimple Thing; did not its Adverſaries endeavor to perplex and puzzle it with *Philoſophical* Niceties, and *minute* Inquiries into the *Modus* of what they cannot comprehend. The firſt Chriſtians

* *Reply*, p. 17. 19. 21.

eaſily

eaſily believed that *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy-Ghoſt*, into whom They were *baptized*, and whom They *worſhip'd*, were equally *divine*; without troubling themſelves about the manner of it, or the reconciling it with their Belief in one *God*. As Men generally believe that God *fore-knows* every thing, and that Man notwithſtanding is a *free Agent*, (ſcarce one perhaps in a Thouſand concerning Himſelf how to reconcile theſe two Poſitions, or being at all apprehenſive of any difficulty in it) ſo, probably, the plain honeſt Chriſtians believed every Perſon to be God, and all but one God; and troubled not their Heads with any nice Speculations about the *Modus* of it. This ſeems to have been the artleſs Simplicity of the primitive Chriſtians, till prying and pretending Men came to ſtart Difficulties, and raiſe Scruples, and make Diſturbance; and then it was neceſſary to guard the Faith of the Church againſt ſuch Cavils and Impertinencies as began to threaten it. *Philoſophy* and *Metaphyſicks* were called in to it's Aſſiſtance; but not till *Hereticks* had ſhown the way, and made it in a manner neceſſary for the *Catholicks* to encounter Them with their own Weapons. Some new Terms, and particular *Explications* came in by this means; that ſuch as had a mind to Corrupt or Deſtroy the Faith, might be defeated in their Purpoſes. It was needleſs to ſay that Generation was *without Diviſion*, while no Body ſuſpected or thought of any *Diviſion* in the Caſe: But after *Hereticks*

ticks had invidiously represented the *Catholicks* as asserting a *Division*, it was high time for the *Catholicks* to resent the Injury, and to deny the Charge. There was no occasion for the mentioning of Three *Hypostases*, till such as *Praxeas*, *Noetus*, and *Sabellius*, had pretended to make, *one Hypostasis*, an Article of Faith; drawing many very *Novel*, and dangerous Consequences from their prime Position. The ὁμοούσιον it self might have been spared, at least, out of the *Creeds*, had not a fraudulent abuse of good words brought Matters to that pass, that the *Catholick* Faith was in danger of being lost, even under *Catholick* Language. To return to our Point: There would be no occasion now for distinguishing between *Subordination* of *Order* and of *Nature*, were it not manifest how much the *Catholick* Faith may be endanger'd by the endeavors of Some, to slip one upon us for the other. Such as know any thing of *fair* Controversy, may justly expect of you, that you support your Cause, not by repeating and inculcating the word *Subordinate* (as if there was a charm in Syllables, or Men were to be led away by Sounds) but by proving, in a rational manner, that *all Subordination* implies such an *Inferiority* as you contend for. If this can be done, the Doctor's 300 Texts (which are very good Texts, and have undoubtedly an excellent meaning) may appear also to be pertinent to the Cause in Hand.

QUERY

QUERY XXI.

Whether He be not forc'd to supply his want of Scripture-proof by very strain'd and remote Inferences, and very uncertain Reasonings from the Nature of a Thing, confessedly, obscure and above Comprehension; and yet not more so than God's Eternity, Ubiquity, Prescience, *or other Attributes, which yet we are obliged to acknowledge for certain Truths?*

TO the former part of the Query, you *answer directly in the Negative.* To which I rejoin, that I still maintain the *Affirmative*, and can readily make it good. The Doctor's insinuating from the 300 Texts (which stile the Father *God* absolutely, or the one God) that the Son is not strictly and *essentially* God, not one God with the Father, is a strain'd and remote Inference of his *own*; not warranted by Scripture, nor countenanc'd by Catholick Antiquity; but Contradictory to Both. Besides this, I must observe to you, that the main Strength of the Doctor's Cause lies, first, in his giving either a * *Sabellian*, or *Tritheistick* turn (admitting † no *Medium*) to the *Catholick* Doctrine; and then charging it with *Confusion* of *Persons*,

* *See Instances*, Script. Doctr. p. 99. 102. 293. 426. 465. Reply, p. 35. 38. 51. 53. 93. 121.

† Script. Doctr. p. 86. 132. 415. 430. 435. 437. 441. 447. 455. 465.

Poly-

Polytheiſm, *Non-ſenſe*, or *Contradiction*. Take away That, to which his conſtant reſort is, whenever He comes to the pinch of the Queſtion, and there will be little left conſiderable. He ſhows his Reader *Tritheiſm*, and He ſhows Him *Sabellianiſm* (keeping the *Catholick* Doctrine, which is Neither, out of ſight) and then recommends *Arianiſm* (diſguis'd) to Him, as the beſt of the Three. Now, ſince the *Catholick* Doctrine has been generally thought different from any of the Three, and more followed than all the reſt put together, it ought to have been fairly preſented, in company with the other; that ſo the Reader, having all the *Four* before Him, might be the more able to paſs a right Judgment of Them. You will frequently find the learned Doctor combating the *Catholick* Faith under the diſguiſe of *Sabellianiſm*, as if there was no Difference between them: Or if it be at all diſtinguiſh'd from *Sabellianiſm*, it immediately commences *Tritheiſm*; and a plurality of *Co-ordinate* Perſons is inevitable with the learned Doctor: This is the Sum of his Performance. *Scripture*, indeed, is brought in, and *Fathers* too, which is ſtill more ſurprizing: But the whole, in a manner, is this one *Syllogiſm*.

If the Son be *Conſubſtantial* with God the Father, He muſt be either *individually* or *ſpecifically* ſo: But the former is *Sabellianiſm*, the latter *Tritheiſm*, Both abſurd: Therefore, *&c.*——

The

The learned Doctor very well knows, how easy it would be to match this *Syllogism*, or *Sophism*, with others, of the like kind, against *Omnipresence*, *Eternity*, *Prescience*, and even *Self-existence:* which, in reverence to the Subject, and for prudential Reasons, I forbear; sorry to find the Cause put upon such a way of reasoning, as tends to undermine something more than the Doctrine of the Trinity. But I proceed.

To give the better Colour to his Charge of *Tritheism*, the Doctor * every where takes it for granted (which was the only way, when it could not be proved) that God the Son cannot be *really* distinct, and strictly *divine* too, unless He be *Co-ordinate*, in all Respects, with the Father; which would be contrary to the Supposition of his being a *Son*, and *second* Person. Two *Co-ordinate* Persons, it seems, They must be; or else one of them must inevitably be a *Creature:* This is plainly his meaning, however studiously He avoids the word *Creature*; chusing rather to insinuate covertly, what is too gross to appear in broad Terms. The whole, you see, terminates in a *Philosophical* Question: And what occasion have we for *Scripture*, or *Fathers* (except it be to amuse our Readers) if *Philosophy* can so easily end the Dispute? For it is very certain that neither *Scripture* nor *Fathers* can add force to, if *concurring*; nor, if *reclaiming*, be able to stand

* Script. Doctr. p. 86. 415. 430. 437. 441. 447. 455. 465.

againſt, clear and evident Demonſtration. But *Demonſtration* is the thing wanting: As to *Preſumptions*, and *Conjectures*, we are in no Pain about them. I ſhall have a farther occaſion to conſider the Charge of *Tritheiſm* hereafter; and therefore, diſmiſſing it for the preſent, ſhall return to the Buſineſs of the *Query*.

To the latter part of it you anſwer, that *God's Attributes are ſo far from being above Comprehenſion, that they are all ſtrictly demonſtrable by Reaſon.* You was ſenſible this was wide; and therefore very juſtly corrected it, in the Words immediately following. *But I am willing to ſuppoſe* (How could you make any doubt of it?) *That the Author meant, that the* MANNER *of their Exiſtence in the divine Nature, is above Comprehenſion; and ſo indeed it is.* Very well; and yet you believe the *reality* of thoſe *Attributes*. Why then ſo *unequal* and *partial*, with reſpect to the Trinity, the caſe being exactly the ſame? Why may not the Thing be true, though the MANNER, or *Modus* of it, be above Comprehenſion? You add, *Tho' the manner of the Son's Derivation is above Comprehenſion, yet his real Subordination is ſtrictly demonſtrable*, p. 99.

Tantamne Rem tam negligenter!

Here the Argument was, in a manner, brought to a Head; and the Fate of the Controverſy depended on this Article. Here you had a fair

Oppor-

Opportunity given you of laying on your Charge of Contradictions, if you had any you could depend on; and of clearing God's Attributes (particularly, the Three mention'd) from being liable to the same, or the like Charge. But, instead of this, you walk calmly off with one Sentence; in which, to be plain with you, it will be hard to find either Weight, or Pertinency. If you mean, by *real Subordination*, the Subordination of a *Creature* to God; or of one Person inferior in *Nature* to another of a *higher*, *superior*, or *more perfect* Nature; it is not *demonstrable from Scripture*; nor can it, any way, be proved: If you mean any thing else, it is not pertinent.

You are so kind as to allow the *Manner* of the Son's *Derivation*, or Generation, to be *above Comprehension*. The *Eunomians*, your Predecessors in this Controversy, * thought (and They thought right) that, in order to support their Cause, it would be necessary to affirm the Nature of God to be *Comprehensible*, or not above Human Comprehension; and therefore it is that † *Philostorgius* censures *Eusebius* for closing in with the contrary Opinion. You are more modest; They more consistent: For, indeed, this Controversy, manag'd upon the Foot of meer Reason, terminates at length in that single Question, *whether the*

* Epiph. Hæres. 76. p. 916. Socrat. E. H. l. 4. c. 7. p. 176. Theodorit. Hæret. Fab. l. 4. c. 3. Cyrill. Alex. Thesaur. p. 260. Ed. Paris.

† Philostorg. lib. 1. p. 468. Ed. Vales.

Essence of God be above Comprehension, or no. The *Catholicks* stood up for the *Affirmative*, the wiser, but bolder *Arians* maintain'd the *Negative:* And this is what, if you understand your own Principles, and will be at the Pains to trace Them to the last result, you'l be obliged to take Shelter in, or to give up your Cause, so far as concerns all Arguments drawn from the Nature and Reason of the Thing. Some of our English *Socinians* have express'd Themselves as roundly, upon this Head, as any of the Antient *Arians*, or *Eunomians*; declaring the divine Nature to be no more *mysterious* than that of his Creatures. Such Assertions are shocking; but there is a necessity for them, if some Men will be consistent, and ingenuous enough to speak out. They would not advance such bold Paradoxes, if They were not forc'd to it.

Before I leave this *Query*, it will be proper to acquaint our Readers what we mean by believing *Mysteries*. For I find that this is a Matter which is apt to give great Offence, and to occasion many sad and tragical Complaints. * Dr. *Whitby* is one of the most considerable Men that I have observed giving into that popular way of Reasoning, which had been formerly left (as it ought to be still) to Writers of a lower Class. He is very much disturbed that any thing should be proposed as an *Article* of *Faith*, which is not to be *understood:* And

* Disquis. Modest. Præf. p. 19.

observes,

obſerves, that no Man in his ſober Senſes can give his aſſent to what He *underſtands* not; meaning, underſtands *not at all*. He is certainly very right, I do not ſay pertinent, in the Remark: And I may venture to add, that no Man, whether *ſober*, or otherwiſe, can do it. For, undoubtedly, where there is no *Idea*, there can be no Aſſent; becauſe *aſſenting to nothing*, is the very ſame with *not aſſenting*. Thus far, we are perfectly agreed. But for the clearing up of this Matter, I ſhall endeavor to reduce what relates to it, to the following Particulars, as ſo many diſtinct Caſes.

1. Let the firſt Caſe be, where the Terms of a Propoſition, Subject and Predicate (or either of Them) are not at all underſtood by the Perſon to whom it is given. For inſtance; the Words, *Mene mene Tekel Upharſin*, carried no Idea at all with them, till the Prophet had interpreted them; before which King *Belſhazzar* could give no Aſſent to them. The ſame is the caſe of any Propoſition given in an unknown Language, or in ſuch words, of a known Language, as a Perſon underſtands not. Only, I would have it obſerv'd, that, in ſuch a Caſe, a Man neither admits nor rejects the *Propoſition*; becauſe to Him it is no *Propoſition*, but meerly Sounds or Syllables.

2. A ſecond Caſe is, when the Propoſition is given in a Language well underſtood, and in Words which ordinarily convey *Ideas* to the

Mind; but Words so put together, in that Instance, as to furnish us with no certain and determinate Meaning. A late Anonymous Writer has hit upon a very proper Example of this very Case. *A Woman ought to have Power on her Head, because of the Angels.* The Words, *Woman*, *Power*, *Head*, *Angels*, are all plain Words, and carry with Them obvious familiar *Ideas*. And yet a Man may have no *Idea* of what is asserted in that Proposition; and therefore can give no assent to it, more than this; that it is true in some Sense or other, or that something should be believed, if He understood what: which is not assenting to that Proposition, but to Another; namely, that *whatever Scripture asserts, is true.* The aforesaid Author observes, very shrowdly, that having no certain *Ideas* of the Terms of the *Proposition*, it is to Him a *Mystery*. I may add, that the *Pertinency* of his Observation is another such *Mystery*; and the Justice and Equity of his drawing a Parallel between This, and the *Mysteries* of *Christianity*, properly so called, must be a *Mystery* to as many as cannot perceive either the *Sense* or the *Ingenuity* of doing it. But,

3. Another Case may be, when the Terms of a Proposition are understood, but are so connected or divided, as to make a Proposition manifestly repugnant. *A Triangle is a Square. A Globe is not round*, or the like. Such Propositions we reject; not because we do not understand

derstand Them, but because we do; and understand Them to be False. Sometimes indeed a Contradiction lies conceal'd under the Words it is couch'd in, till it be resolved into plainer. For Instance: This Proposition, *The Existence of a First-Cause is demonstrable*, a priori: As it lies under these Terms, it seems reducible to Case the Second; as being Sound without Sense. But resolve it into This; *There is a Cause prior to the First*; and then the * Repugnancy appears. So again: *Necessity of Existence is antecedently (in order of Nature) the Cause or Ground of that Existence.* These are only so many Syllables. But put it thus: *A property is, in order of Nature, antecedent to, and the Ground and Cause of the Subject which supports it*; and the *Contradiction* is manifest. Once more: *Necessity absolute and antecedent (in order of Nature) to the Existence of the First-Cause, must operate every where alike.* This Proposition seems to fall under Case the Second. But let it be resolved into plainer Words; and then it will appear that this is the proper place for it.

4. A fourth Case is, when the Terms of the Proposition carry *Ideas* with them, *seemingly*, but not *plainly* repugnant. For example: *God* Certainly *foreknows Events depending on* Un-

* Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐπιστήμῃ λαμβάνεται τῇ ἀποδεικτικῇ· αὕτη γὰρ ἐκ προτέρων, καὶ γνωριμωτέρων συνίσταται. τοῦ δὲ ἀγεννήτου οὐδὲν προϋπάρχει. Clem. Alex. Strom. p. 696.

certain *Cauſes*. *The omnipreſent Subſtance is not extended.* Propoſitions of this kind may be, and are aſſented to; becauſe there may be a greater Appearance of Repugnancy on the oppoſite Side of the Queſtion; or, becauſe there is not reaſon ſufficient for ſuſpending Aſſent.

5. A fifth Caſe is, when a Propoſition is form'd in *general* Terms, and reaches not to *minute* Particulars. *The pure in Heart ſhall* ſee God. The Phraſe of *ſeeing God*, conveys ſome *Idea*, but *general* only; not particular, preciſe, or determinate. *At God's right Hand are Pleaſures for evermore.* God's *right Hand*, and *Pleaſures*, we have only *general* confuſe *Ideas* of: yet *Ideas* we have; and we aſſent as far as our *Ideas* reach. Having no more than a general confuſe Perception, our Faith in ſuch Points can riſe no higher, or reach no farther; nor can more be expected of us.

6. A ſixth Caſe is, when the Terms of a Propoſition convey *Ideas*, but *Ideas* of *pure Intellect*; ſuch as *Imagination* can lay no hold of. Philoſophers have illuſtrated this by the Inſtances of a *Chiliagon* and a *Triangle*. We *underſtand* what is meant by a Figure of a *Thouſand* Sides, as clearly, as we do what is meant by one of *Three* only: But we *imagine* one more diſtinctly than the other. This Inſtance belongs more properly to *diſtinct* and *confuſe* Imagination, than to the purpoſe it is brought for. *Ideas* of Numbers, in the Abſtract,

ſtract, are properly *Ideas* of *pure Intellect*: And ſo are, or ſhould be, our *Ideas* of our own Souls, of *Angels*, of *God*: We may *underſtand* ſeveral Things of them; but *Imagination* has very little to do in ſuch Matters. However, our not being able to *imagine*, provided we do but *underſtand*, is no hindrance to our Aſſent, in Propoſitions of this kind.

7. The laſt and eaſieſt Caſe is, when the Terms convey full and ſtrong *Ideas* to the *Underſtanding* and *Imagination* alſo. For inſtance: The Man *Chriſt Jeſus ate, drank, ſlept*, was *crucified, died*, and was *buried*, &c. Here, all is eaſy, clear, and plain, even to Thoſe who love not to think upon the Stretch, or to be under any pain in Aſſenting.

Now for the Application of the foregoing Particulars to the point in Hand. Thoſe Articles of Faith, which the Church has called *Myſteries*, belong not to *Caſe* the *firſt* or *ſecond*, wherein no Aſſent can be given: Or if They do, They are no Articles of Faith, but ſo many Sounds or Syllables. It is to be hoped, They come not under *Caſe* the *third*: For *plain* Contradictions are certainly no *Myſteries*, any more than *plain* Truths; as is juſtly obſerved by the learned * Dr. *Clarke*. For the ſame reaſon, They fall not under *Caſe* the *ſeventh*, where every thing is ſuppoſed diſtinct, clear, and particular as can be deſired. What-

* Reply, *p.* 38.

ever

ever is plainly reducible to any of the *four* Cases now mention'd, is either no *Matter of Faith* at all, or no *Mystery*. There remain *three* Cases; where the *Ideas* are either seemingly *repugnant*, or such as reach not to *Particulars*, or such as *Imagination* has no concern with. Assent may be given in all these Cases, as hath been already observed; and so, possibly, here we may find *Articles of Faith*: And, if some Gentlemen will give us leave, after we have thus explain'd what we mean by the *Term*, we will call such Articles *Mysteries*. For Example.

The Belief of *Three Persons* every one singly *God*, and All together *one God*, seems to fall under *Case* the *fourth*: The *Ideas* are *seemingly*, not *really* repugnant. We know what we mean, in saying *every one*, as clearly as if we said, *any one*, is *God*; a Person having such and such *essential* Perfections. We see not perfectly how this is *reconciled* with the Belief of *one God*, as we see not how *Prescience* is reconciled with *future Contingents*. Yet we believe Both, not doubting but that there is a *Connexion* of the *Ideas*, tho' our Faculties reach not up to it.

Omnipresence, I think, is another *Mystery*, and falls chiefly under Case the *fifth*. We have a *general confuse Idea* of it, and mean something by it. The *particular manner* how it is, we have no notion of; and therefore are not obliged to believe any particular *Modus*. Fix

upon

upon this or that, there are *appearing* Repugnancies and Inconſiſtencies; and ſo far, this is reducible to *Caſe* the *fourth*, as well as *fifth*.

The *Incarnation* of the Son of God is another *Myſtery*, and comes under Caſe the *fourth* and *fifth*. There are ſome *ſeeming*, not *real* Repugnancies; and the *Ideas* we have of it are *general* and *confuſe*, not *particular* nor *ſpecial*. Such as our *Ideas* are, ſuch muſt our *Faith* be; and we cannot *believe* farther than we *conceive*; for *Believing* is *Conceiving*; *confuſely*, if *Ideas* are *confuſe*; *generally*, if *general*; *diſtinctly* and *adequately*, if *diſtinct* and *adequate*.

The *Generation* of the Son of God is another *Myſtery*. *Ideas* we have of it, and know what we mean by it. But being *Spiritual*, *Imagination* can lay no hold of them; being *general* and *confuſe*, we cannot reach to *Particulars*; and being *ſeemingly* repugnant, we cannot make out the entire Connexion. *Equality of Nature* (which is part of the Notion) is a *general* Idea, and well underſtood; *Reference to a Head or Fountain*, is *general* too, but more *confuſe*, and beſides, *figurative*; *Eternal* Reference *very confuſe*, as the *Idea* of *Eternity* neceſſarily muſt be; *Inſeparability*, is general, obſcure, negative, and we know but very imperfectly what the Union of Spiritual Things means. Nevertheleſs we *underſtand* enough (tho' we can *imagine* little) to make it properly an Article of Belief; and

no

no Man can reasonably pretend to reject it, as having no Meaning, or carrying no *Idea* at all with it. We assent as far as our *Ideas* reach, for we can do no more: We believe in *part*, what is revealed in *part*; our Faith keeping pace with our *Ideas*, and ending where They end.

The *Simplicity* of God is another *Mystery*, of which we have some, but a very imperfect, general, and obscure *Idea*. It may fall under *Case* the *fifth* and *sixth*. *Scripture* says little of it: We have took it chiefly from *Metaphysicks*, which are short and defective. When we come to inquire, whether *all extension*, or *all plurality*, *diversity*, Composition of *Substance* and *Accident*, and the like, be consistent with it, then it is that we discover how *confuse* and *inadequate* our *Ideas* are. And hence it is, that, while all Parties admit the divine *Simplicity*, in the general, yet when they come to be press'd with it in dispute, they often give different accounts of it; and easily so explain and state the Notion, as to make it suit with their particular Schemes. To this Head belongs that perplexing Question (beset with Difficulties on all Sides) whether the divine Substance be *extended* or no. And if *Extension* be admitted, ingenious thoughtful Men will divide again, upon another Question, whether *infinite* or no: Some thinking it very absurd for any Attribute of God, not to be *infinite*; others thinking it no less absurd to admit any *infinite* Extension,

Num-

Number, or the like, at all. They that suppose the divine Substance *extended*, lest they should be oblig'd to conceive it as a *point* only; and lest they should admit that any thing can *act where it is not*, are, when press'd with Difficulties about *Aliquot Parts*, forced to admit that any part of That Substance, how great soever, or of whatever Dimensions, must be conceived only as a *point*, in proportion to the *whole:* From whence it follows, that, unless the *World* be *infinite*, all that *Acts* (of that infinite Substance) in the *World*, is but a *point*; and so the whole Substance, except that *point*, either acts not at all in the *World*, or acts *where it is not*. But to proceed:

Self-existence is another *Mystery*, of which we know little: And the learned are hardly agreed whether it be a *negative* or *positive* Idea. Yet every body believes it in the gross, *confusely* and *undeterminately*. It is manifest, on one hand, that the *first Cause* has no *Cause*; neither it self (much less any property of it self) nor any thing else: And yet it may seem very wonderful how any thing should exist without a *Reason a priori*; that is, without a *Cause* for it.

To name no more: *Eternity* it self is the greatest *Mystery* of all. An *Eternity past*, is a Thought which puzzles all our Philosophy; and is too hard for the sharpest Wits to reconcile. The *Nunc stans* of the *Schools* (though older than the *Schools*) has been exploded; and yet *Succession* carries with it insuperable

ſuperable Difficulties. There is nothing peculiar to the Doctrine of the Trinity, any thing near ſo perplexing as *Eternity* is: And yet the Gentlemen, who are for diſcarding *Myſteries*, are forc'd to believe it. I know no Remedy for theſe Things, but an humble Mind; a juſt Senſe of our Ignorance in many Things, and of our imperfect Knowledge in all. Now to return to the learned Dr. *Whitby*.

After a view of the Premiſes, it might be proper to ask Him, whether He diſlikes the *Catholick* Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as *perceiving Contradictions* in it. If this be the Caſe, however concern'd I am for that Doctrine (believing it to be true) I will venture to ſay, it would be an acceptable Piece of Service, if He could any way help others to *perceive* them too. Truth, *certain* Truth, will be always welcome, in any Cauſe, and from any Hand, to all ſober and conſiderate Men. But if this could be done, He ſhould not then complain that He *underſtands not* the Doctrine, but that He *underſtands* (i. e. *diſtinctly* perceives) it to be *Falſe*.

If He means that He has no *Idea* at all of the *Myſtery*, not ſo much as a *general*, *confuſe*, or *inadequate* Apprehenſion of it; that muſt be a miſtake: as may appear from what hath been before obſerved. Beſides that having once, or oftner, wrote for it; (tho' He has ſince laboured very much to perplex, puzzle, and diſparage it) every candid Man muſt believe

believe that He underſtood, in ſome meaſure, formerly, what He ingaged in the Proof of.

If the Caſe be that He does not throughly, fully, and adequately comprehend it, and therefore demurs to it; then it ſhould be conſidered, that the reſult of all is this only; that He will not admit ſo far as He may underſtand, unleſs He may have the privilege to underſtand ſomething more: Which whether it be not too familiar from a *Creature* towards his *Creator*, and articling more ſtrictly with Almighty God than becomes Us, let any wiſe Man judge.

If, laſtly, it be pretended that it is a *Human*, not a *Divine* Doctrine, which He is pleaſed to quarrel with; then let Him cenſure it as *Human* and *Unſcriptural* only; and not as *unintelligible*, and *impoſſible* to be *aſſented* to; and then we may bring the Cauſe to a ſhort Iſſue by inquiring, whether the Doctrine be *Scriptural*, or no. Let Things be called by their right Names, and ſet in their true and proper Light; that Truth may not be ſmother'd, nor any Doctrine (eſpecially ſo Antient and ſo Important a Doctrine) condemn'd, before we know why. So much we owe to the Church of Chriſt, which receives, this Faith; to the Bleſſed Saints and Martyrs, many Centuries upwards, who lived and died in it; to Truth, to God, and to our Selves, as to ſee that it be fairly and impartially examin'd; that *proving all Things*, as we ought to do, in Sincerity and Singleneſs of Heart, we may, at length, be both wiſe enough

enough to know, and ſuitably diſpoſed to *hold faſt that which is good.*

It is excellently remark'd by the ingenious Mr. *Emlyn*, in the *Appendix* to his * *Narrative:* "That the Holy Scriptures require no "accurate Philoſophical Notions of God's *Eter-* "*nity*, *Omnipreſence*, and *Immenſity*, &c. "They are content to give us popular, eaſy ac- "counts of theſe Matters ——— They trouble "not Men with the Niceties of *eternal Suc-* "*ceſſions*, or an eternal τὸ νῦν, without *Suc-* "*ceſſion*; nor with *infinite Spaces*, or of God's "being preſent in *part*, or in *whole*; and the "like *metaphyſical* Difficulties. ——— Our Reli- "gion impoſes no ſuch Difficulties on us, of "believing with the underſtanding, what we "cannot ſo much as *perceive* by it; it only "requires us to believe what it reveals to "us, *i. e.* to our *Underſtanding* and *Appre-* "*henſion.*

All this is very rightly and judiciouſly obſerved. God's *Eternity* and *Omnipreſence* we have only *general* and confuſe *Ideas* of; Scripture has not revealed to us the particular *modus*, or *minute* Circumſtances of Either; and we are not obliged to *believe*, any otherwiſe than as we *apprehend* (*i. e.* confuſely and inadequately) nor indeed is it poſſible. The ſame is the Caſe of three Perſons, *every one truly God*, and all but *one God*; ſo far evident from Scripture, and *apprehended*, in the ge-

* Pag. 61.

neral,

neral, as fully and clearly (perhaps more so) as *Eternity*, *Omnipresence*, or the like. But the particular *modus*, How the *Three* are *One*; and the *minute* Circumstances of their *Union* and *Distinction*, are as much a secret to us, as how God foresees future Contingents, or is present in all places at once. Many have been prying and inquisitive into this Matter, hoping to know something more particularly of it, till they have come to doubt even of the Thing it self, and so have fallen into *Heresy*: And *Catholicks* have sometimes exceeded, in this way, endeavoring to *explain* beyond their *Ideas*; which is really nothing else but multiplying Words. The *Notion* is soon stated, and lies in a little Compass. All that Words are good for, after, is only to fix and preserve that *Notion*, which is not improvable (without a new Revelation) by any new *Idea*; but may be obscured and stifled in a multitude of Words. The most useful words, for fixing the Notion of *Distinction*, are *Person*, *Hypostasis*, *Subsistence*, and the like: For the *Divinity* of each Person, ὁμοούσιος, ἀγένητος, *eternal*, *uncreated*, *immutable*, &c. For their *Union*; περιχώρησις, *interior Generation*, *Procession*, or the like. The design of these Terms is not to enlarge our Views, or to add any thing to our Stock of *Ideas*; but to secure the plain fundamental Truth; that *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost* are all strictly *divine* and *uncreated*; and yet are not *three Gods*, but

one God. He that believes this ſimply, and in the general, as laid down in Scripture, believes enough; and need never trouble his Head with nice Queſtions, whether the Union of three Perſons ſhould be call'd *individual* or *ſpecifick*; whether *Perſon* and *Being* are *reciprocal* Terms; whether every Perſon may be properly ſaid to be *Self-exiſtent*; how three Perſons can be all in the *ſame Place*; whether *all Perfection* might not as well have been confin'd to *one Perſon* only; or whether One might not have been *as good as Three*, and the like. Theſe are *difficiles nugæ*, moſtly, *verbal*, or *vain* Inquiries; and do not concern *common* Chriſtians, any farther than to be upon their Guard, that they be not impoſed on by theſe *Subtilties*, invented to puzzle and perplex a plain *Scripture-Truth*, which is eaſily *perceived* and *underſtood* in the *general*, that is, as far as required to be *believed*. *Minute* Particulars about the *modus*, may be left to *the Diſputers of this World*, as a Trial of their good Senſe, their Piety, Modeſty, and Humility.

We do not take it well to be reproach'd, as running too far into *Metaphyſical* Subtilties, by Men whoſe peculiar Talent it is, to play their *Metaphyſicks*, (that is, their *Preſumptions* about the Nature of a Thing whereof they know little) againſt Scripture and Antiquity, the beſt Guides in thoſe Searches. If the *Catholicks* have ſometimes gone farther than was neceſſary, in particular Explications, it ſhould be remem-

ber'd

ber'd for whose sake They did it; and that it was chiefly with a view to satisfy such as would not be contented with the *general* Truth laid down in Scripture. I shall show, by an Instance or two, how that Matter is. The περιχώρησις and *interior Generation*, are two *Specialities* taught by the Catholicks, and heavily complain'd of by your Friend * Dr. *Whitby*, as *unscriptural* Definitions. Now, these are but Appendages to our Prime (and as we think *Scriptural*) Positions, and we are no farther concern'd for Them, than as they are conceived to hang upon the other; so that your quarrel with us for these, is really finding fault with our leading and *fundamental* Doctrine of *One God in Three Persons*. But to show you, how unequal you are in censuring us for *unscriptural* Terms, observe the Course and Method of dispute which draws us first into it. You argue, suppose, that the Son cannot be *God*, in the strict Sense, without making *Two Gods:* We answer, that *Father* and *Son*, by a most intimate and ineffable Union of *Substance*, *Will*, *Power*, *Presence*, *Operation*, &c. (which we call περιχώρησις) may be one God. You argue again, that if the *Son* be a *Son*, in our Sense, there must be a *division* and *separate* Existence: We say, No; alledging that He may be a *Son* in a *proper* Sense, and in our Sense, without *Division* and without a *separate* Existence; and the name

* Disquisit. Modest. Præf. *p.* 26.

for this is *interior Generation.* After we are come thus far, purſuing your wandrings into the *Philoſophy* of the Thing, you ſtep back again, and tell us, that *Scripture* ſays nothing of this ἐνυπόστατος, or *interior* Generation. Suppoſing (not granting) your Pretence true; Did You ſet out upon the Foot of *Scripture*? Does *Scripture* any where tell you, that two divine Perſons cannot be one God? Or that *Father* and *Son* muſt have a *ſeparate Exiſtence?* You argue only from the Nature and Reaſon of the Thing it ſelf, of which you have no adequate *Idea*; and we anſwer what is ſufficient, and more than ſufficient to confute meer Conjectures in Matters above your reach. Lay You aſide your *unſcriptural* Objections, and We ſhall have no occaſion for *unſcriptural* Anſwers.

I ſhall juſt take notice of an artificial Turn of Mr. *Emlyn*'s, relating to this Subject; and then put an end to this long, but, I hope, uſeful Digreſſion. His Words are as follows: * "The "*Pride of Reaſon*, which hindred (*the Pagan* "*Philoſophers*) from believing in Chriſt, did "not lie in refuſing to ſubmit their Faith to "*myſterious* Speculations, which puzzled their "Reaſon: but, on the Contrary, it lay in a "proud Affectation of Swelling Words and "Philoſophick Myſteries, and not humbling "their Underſtandings to receive a plain Go-"ſpel, and familiar Doctrine.

The Thought is ingenious, and might paſs well;

* *Exam. of Dr.* Bennet, *&c. p. 5. Introduct.*

if

if *Hiſtory*, like *Metaphyſical Arguments*, were to be made merely by ſtrength of Wit. He forgets that the *Myſtery* of the *Reſurrection* was one of thoſe *plain familiar* Things, which the *Pride of their Reaſon* refuſed to ſubmit to. He conſiders not that the *Jews*, and the earlieſt *Hereticks* (much of the ſame Temper with the *Pagan* Philoſophers) were offended at nothing more than at the *Myſtery* of *God Incarnate*; which we learn from *Ignatius*, *Juſtin*, [a] *Irenæus*, [b] *Tertullian*, and [c] other antient Writers: And He need but look into *Juſtin*, *Tatian*, and *Origen*, to find that the *Pagans*, in particular, were in the ſame Sentiments, and join'd in the ſame common Charge againſt the Chriſtian Doctrine. Nay, it may farther appear, from other [d] Evidences, that the very *Myſtery* of the *Trinity*, which is the *Rock of Offence* to ſome even at this Time, gave very early Offence to the *Pagan* Wits; and was much diſreliſh'd by Them: So averſe were They to the receiving of *Myſteries:* And the *Pride* of *Reaſon* wrought, at that Time, much after the ſame manner, as it does at this day; Hu-

a Secundum nullam Sententiam Hæreticorum Verbum Dei caro factum eſt. *Iren.* l. 3. c. 11. p. 189.

b Incredibile præſumpſerant Deum Carnem. *Tertull. Contr. Marc.* l. 3. c. 8.

c Alii quoque Hæretici uſque adeo Chriſti manifeſtam amplexati ſunt Divinitatem, ut dixerint Illum fuiſſe ſine Carne; & Totum illi ſuſceptum detraxerint Hominem, ne decoquerent in illo Divini nominis poteſtatem ſi Humanam illi Sociaſſent, ut arbitrabantur, Nativitatem. *Novat.* c. 18.

d Lucian. Philopatr. Athan. Orat. 3. p. 564.

man Nature being always the ſame. But it is now high time to proceed.

QUERY XXII.

Whether his (the Doctor's) *whole Performance, whenever He differs from us, be any thing more than a Repetition of this Aſſertion, that* Being *and* Perſon *are the ſame, or that there is no* Medium *between* Tritheiſm *and* Sabellianiſm? *Which is removing the cauſe from Scripture to natural Reaſon, not very conſiſtently with the Title of his Book.*

IT is of ſmall Importance to obſerve how the Doctor has proved ſuch Points, as He and We Both agree in. He might have ſpared the unneceſſary Pains and have took a ſhorter way with us, had his Cauſe been ſuch as could be ſerved by cloſe Argument. He need not have told us ſo often that the Father is *eminently* ſtiled, the one God, or that the Son is *Subordinate*. We allow all That: The Conſequence which He draws from it, and covertly inſinuates to his Reader, is the Thing we doubt of. This was the Point which ſhould have been labour'd, for the Conviction of wiſe and conſidering Men. He has a deal to ſay in Defence of what no Body oppoſes; and may there triumph ſecurely without an Adverſary: But when He comes to the *point* of *Difference*, the

the *pinch* of the *Question*, there it is that He discovers his want of Proof, and how little He has to depend on, besides that one *precarious* Principle intimated in the *Query*; which indeed runs thro' his whole Performance, and is often *suppos'd*, but never *prov'd*.

By this Principle He [a] eludes the Force of the first Chapter of St. *John*'s Gospel; And He refers to it again upon [b] *Acts* 20. 28. [c] 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. *Joh.* 5. 18. By the same Principle, He evades the Force of [d] *Joh.* 8. 58. [e] *Joh.* 12. 41. [f] *Joh.* 5. 23. And so He might have done with any Number of Texts, however full and express for the *Received* Doctrine: For, by the same [g] Maxim, He draws over the *Nicene*-Creed, and does not despair of bringing in the [h] *Athanasian* also. From hence it is visible, wherein the strength of his Performance lies; and what it is that He chiefly trusts to. It is not *Scripture*, it is not *Antiquity*, but a *Philosophical* Principle; to which Scripture, Fathers, Councils, Creeds, every Thing, must yield. And indeed had it been a principle of *true* and *sound* Philosophy, every reasonable Man would be willing to pay the utmost Deference to it: But it appears, at length, to be that kind of *vain Philosophy*, which is often intruding where it has nothing to do. The Subject is sublime and above Comprehension. We have no *intrinsick*

a Script. Doctr. p. 86. b Id. p. 87. c Id. p. 88. 97. d Id. p. 99. e p. 102. f p. 132. g p. 465. h p. 428. 430. 435. &c.

Evidence, no *Ideas* to build any thing *certainly* upon. *Extrinsick* Evidence, *Divine* Revelation, is *here* all in all; And the only proper use of our rational Faculties, is to inquire into the true and genuine Sense of it. To *philosophize* here from the *Nature* and *Reason* of the Thing it self, of which we know little, is chusing to be still in the Dark, when we have Light before us; and is not, properly, following our *Reason*, but our *Conceits*, *Fancies*, and fond *Conjectures*. You are pleased to say, in Defence of the learned Doctor, that *if He had done no more than proved* intelligent Being *and* Person *to be the same, it must for ever remain an unanswerable Difficulty*, &c. Right, if He had *proved* what He has not, something might be said. I have *before observed to you, that the word, *Being*, bears two Senses; and that you your Selves will not call any thing a *Being*, but a *separate* Being. Excuse the *Trinitarians* for being reserved, after your Example, in so tender a point; and for endeavoring to speak *properly*, as well as to think *justly*, in things pertaining unto God. All that the Doctor hath proved, or can prove, is only this; that *separate* Persons are so many *intelligent Beings*; which we readily admit: But *united* Persons, or Persons having *no separate Existence*, may be *one Being*, *one Substance*, *one God*, notwithstanding. And that you may not think that I Skreen my self under *dark* Words, or *obscure* Distinctions, I will tell you frankly the

* Qu. 9. p. 167.

mean-

meaning of what I have now ſaid. It is little more than this, that Perſons ſo united as to make *one Being*, may be *one Being*. I ſuppoſe the *Affirmative*, that They *may be ſo united*; having ſufficient Grounds for it in Scripture, and in Catholick Antiquity. It lies upon you, in this Caſe, to prove the *Negative*, *viz.* that no Union, whatever, can make two Perſons *one Being*, *one* τὸ Θεῖον, *one God:* You are to ſhow the Suppoſition to be impoſſible, in the Nature of the Thing: That is (as I humbly conceive) you are to prove what you can know nothing of; and are to work up a Demonſtration without *Ideas*. There the Matter reſts, and, I am perſwaded, muſt reſt, till you pleaſe to come out of *Metaphyſicks*; and to put the Cauſe upon the Foot of *Scripture* and *Antiquity*, the only Lights in this Matter. Strange that, at this Time of Day, Any need to be told (what * *Unbelievers* only doubted of formerly) that Scripture is our Rule to go by, for forming our Notions of God; and not the light of Nature, which is darkneſs in Compariſon.

You are offended at the *Queriſt* for ſaying that the Doctor admits no *Medium* between *Tritheiſm* and *Sabellianiſm*. I ſhould have ſaid, it ſeems, *no Medium* for his *Adverſaries*,

* Οὔτε γὰρ φύσει, οὔτε ἀνθρωπίνῃ ἐννοίᾳ, οὕτω μεγάλα καὶ θεῖα γινώσκειν ἀνθρώποις δυνατὸν, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἄνωθεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἁγίους ἄνδρας τηνικαῦτα κατελθούσῃ δωρεᾷ. Juſt. Mart. Paræn. p. 60.

Πανταχόθεν τοίνυν εἰδέναι προσήκει, ὅτι οὐδαμῶς ἑτέρως περὶ Θεοῦ ἢ τῆς ὀρθῆς θεοσεβείας μανθάνειν οἷόν τε, ἢ παρὰ τῶν προφητῶν μόνον, τῶν διὰ τῆς θείας ἐπιπνοίας διδασκόντων ὑμᾶς. Ibid. p. 129. Ed. Ox.

and

and you wonder at ſo *palpable* a *miſtake*. Indeed, the meaning of what I ſaid was ſo *palpable*, that there was no occaſion for *guard*, while I ſuppoſed my ſelf writing to a Man of Senſe. You have took it right ſo far: The Doctor allows Us, his *Adverſaries*, no *Medium*. But I had an Eye to ſomething more, *viz.* that He has, by the ſame Principle, left no *Medium* for Himſelf; as I ſhall ſhow you, in due Time. I am only to obſerve now, that it is not from Scripture, or from *Catholick* Antiquity, that the Doctor has learn'd this Maxim, of *no Medium* (for ſuch as believe Chriſt to be *eſſentially* God) between *Sabellianiſm* and *Tritheiſm*. This was what I complain'd of, his making a Pompous Appearance of Scripture and Fathers, when the whole is made to depend upon a meer *philoſophical* Queſtion, which is to be the Rule and Meaſure to try *Scripture* and *Fathers* by. Let *Scripture*, or *Fathers* appear ever ſo ſtrong and clear for ſuch a *Medium*, They are condemn'd before-hand, either to ſpeak another Senſe, or to be of no Weight or Authority. If this be the Caſe (as you ſeem to admit) you ought to go upon very ſure Grounds. And yet the learned Doctor, inſtead of favouring us with any proof of his main Poſition which gives the Law to the reſt, has only often repeated it; which is no more than to ſay, there cannot be any *Medium*, in the Caſe; no, there cannot. We do not pretend to be wiſe enough to know any thing, *a priori*, whether

ther there *can*, or there *cannot*; But, *a posteriori*, we may inquire after *Fact*: And if we find by Scripture, rightly understood, that there really is such a *Medium*; we shall not be concern'd for any pretended Strength of your *Maxim* against it.

Our Defence then against the Charge of *Tritheism* will be as follows. By comparing Scripture with Scripture, we plainly find that the *divine* Unity is not an Unity of *Person*: We observe, that there are more Persons than one dignified with the same high Titles of *Lord*, *God*, &c. invested with the same high Powers, Attributes, and Perfections; and intitled to the same Honour, Worship, and Adoration: And yet the Scripture never tells us of two *true Gods*, but constantly asserts that God is One. We take notice, that the Father is *Jehovah*, and Son is *Jehovah*, and yet the Lord *Jehovah* is One Lord; The Father *creates*, and the Son *creates*, and yet we have no Warrant to say *Two Creators*; The Father is *worship'd*, and the Son is *worship'd*, and yet we find no Foundation for asserting *two Objects* of *Worship*, or *Two Worships*: In a word, the Father is *God*, and the Son is *God*, and yet we are no where taught to call Them *Two Gods*. The obvious Conclusion, from these Premises, is, that They are Both *one God* (otherwise indeed *Ditheism* is unavoidable) and thus the Scripture-notion of Unity is of more Persons than One in the same Godhead. What confirms us

in

in this reaſoning, is that our Bleſſed Lord has told us, that He and the Father *are one*; that whoſoever hath *ſeen* Him, hath *ſeen the Father*; that He is *in the Father*, and the Father *in Him*; and very familiarly ſpeaking of the Father and Himſelf, He ſays, *we will come unto Him* (that loveth Chriſt) *and make our abode with Him.* Theſe Things ſerve to illuſtrate and explain each other; and, all together, abundantly make good the Poſition before laid down, that * Father and Son are *one God.* Accordingly the Prophet † *Iſaiah*, as interpreted by ‡ St. *John*, makes them Both to be One *Holy, Holy, Lord of Hoſts*, therein ſignifying both the Diſtinction of Perſons, and Unity of Godhead. Theſe Conſiderations (with many others too long to recite) convince us that there is a *Medium*, (ſaving the Son's *eſſential* Divinity) between *Sabellianiſm* and *Tritheiſm.* We aſſert not Three Abſolute, Original, Co-ordinate Divinities, like the *Marcionites*; We *ſeparate* not the Perſons from each other, with the *Arians*; we hold not a meer *ſpecifick* Unity (ſuch as between two Individuals of any Species, two Men, for Inſtance) If we did any of theſe, there might be ſome colour for the Charge of *Tritheiſm.* But we acknowledge, with the Scri-

* *I have hitherto waved the Conſideration of the* Holy-Ghoſt; *for which reaſon alſo, I paſs it over here, confining my ſelf chiefly to the point of the Son's* Divinity, *which if ſufficiently clear'd, the other, I ſuppoſe, may be admitted without Scruple.*

† Iſai. Ch. 6. ‡ Joh. 12. 41.

Vid. Athanaſ. p. 877. 889. Ed. Bened.

ptures,

ptures, one God the Father with his *Co-essential* and *Co-eternal* Son and Spirit; One Head and Fountain of all; the three Divine Persons being One in Nature, One in Knowledge, in Presence, in Operation and Energy; never Separate, never Asunder; distinct without Division, united without Confusion. If this be *Tritheism*, it is what Scripture has taught Us, and what God, who best knows his own Nature, hath recommended to Us. But it is not *Tritheism*; it is the true and only *Medium*, which may be found by looking in Scripture for it; and which you seem to have lost by following a false Light, and wandring too far in fanciful Speculations.

To confirm us still more in this, we perceive, upon due Inquiry, that Those who lived, nearest the Apostolical Age, and best knew the mind of the Scriptures, They also taught the same Doctrine which we teach. There was some Appearance of *Tritheism* in it then, as there is now; which is an Argument to us, that it is still the same: But if any Christian seriously took upon Him to charge the Doctrine with *Tritheism*, and persisted in it, He was immediately rejected by the wiser and soberer Christians, as a *Heretick*.

Praxeas about the Year 186, began openly to charge the *Catholicks* with *Tritheism*. But his Pretences were easily despised by the Church; and his Arguments answer'd by *Tertullian*.

Not

Not long after, *Noetus* revived the Charge, and his [a] Plea was that God is One, and that there could not be a *plurality* in the Godhead. But He went away with the Character of a weak and rash Man; and was condemn'd by the Christian Church. At the same Time, the *Noetians* had so high an Opinion of the Divinity of Christ (Scripture and Tradition running strong for it) that [b] They had no way of solving the difficulty, but by making Father and Son *one Person*, and, in Consequence, were *Patripassians*.

About the middle of the third *Century* arose *Sabellius*. He pretended to be extremely zealous for the *Unity*, and [c] charged the *Catholicks* with asserting *Three Gods*. He has been thought to have refined upon the *Noetian* Scheme (if we may call it *refining*) by denying a *God incarnate*, after the Example of the earlier *Hereticks*; by which He avoided the Error of the *Patripassians*. If so, He may be look'd upon as holding nearly the same Principles with the modern *Socinians*. This Conjecture is grounded on a Passage in [d] *Epiphanius*. But [e] St. *Austin* understood the Matter otherwise,

a Epiphan. Hær. 57. p. 480. Theod. Hæret. Fab. l. 3. c. 3. Hippol. Contr. Noet. c. 11. p. 14.

b Ne videantur *duos Deos* dicere, neque rursus negare Salvatoris Divinitatem, unam eandemque Substantiam Patris ac Filii asseverant: Id est duo quidem nomina secundum diversitatem Causarum recipientem, Unam tamen Hypostasin subsistere, id est, Unam Personam duobus nominibus subjacentem, qui latine Patripassiani appellantur. *Orig. apud Pamph. Apol.* p. 226. *Ed. Bened.*

c Epiphan. Hæres. 62. p. 514.

d Epiphan. Synops. Tom. 1. l. 2. p. 389. Ed. Petav.

e Aust. Hæres. 41. and

and the *Sabellians* have been generally reckon'd with the *Patripassians*.

Within a few Years after *Sabellius*, *Paul* of *Samosata* carried on the same Charge of [a] *Tritheism*, against the *Catholicks*; and was a warm, injudicious [b] Asserter of the *Unity*, confining it to the *Father* only, exclusive of the other Persons. But the *Catholick* Bishops, as [c] *Eusebius* informs us, ran together against Him, as against a Wolf, that was endeavoring to destroy the Flock of Christ.

About Fifty Years after Him, appeared *Arius*; who, to avoid [d] *Tritheism* (as He thought) and to preserve the Unity of the Godhead, and that there might be *one* [e] *Self existent Being*, or *Person* (The same Pretexts, in the main, which had been handed down by some [f] before *Praxeas*, as well as by *Praxeas* Himself, and *Noetus*, *Sabellius*, and *Paul* of *Samosata*) denied the *Divinity* of the second Person, only allowing a *real* Pre-existence, and so making Him more antient than the others before mention'd did. Such were the Men, who formerly (joining therein with [g] *Jews* and *Pagans*) charged the *Catholicks* with holding a *plurality* of Gods: While the *Catholicks* notwithstand-

a Epist. Synod. Antioch. Lab. Tom. 1. p. 845.
b Theodoret. Hæret. Fab. l. 2. c. 8. Athanas. Vol. 2. p. 942.
c Euseb. Eccl. Hist. l. 7. c. 27.
d Ep. Alexand. apud Theod. E. H. l. 1. c. 4.
e Ἓν τὸ ἀγέννητον, εἷς ἀγέννητος.
f Vid. Novatian. c. 30.
g Athan. Vol. 1. p. 564. Lucian. Philopatr.

ing,

ing, retained the Faith; despising the Accusation, as weak, false, and groundless; and defending Themselves upon such Principles as have been before mention'd. None were ever condemn'd by the Church as *Tritheists*, but such as either denied the *Unity* of *Principium*, or made the *Hypostases* Heterogeneous, separate or *aliene* from each other.

We have seen then, that there is no just ground from *Scripture* or *Antiquity*, to charge our Doctrine with *Tritheism*. If there be any pretence from the Nature and Reason of the thing it self, it is of very slight moment. The *divine Nature* is best known from *Revelation*: It is from thence we discover that God is not μονοπρόσωπος, a single *Hypostasis*, but that the Father has his Co essential and Co-eternal Son and Holy-Spirit, always in Him and with Him. We can have no right Conception of the *one God* (to use the Words of * *Hippolytus*) but by believing in a *real* Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost. This is the Faith of the ever blessed *Trinity*; which Scripture and Fathers hold forth to Us; and which is too strongly supported, to be weaken'd by any Wit or Criticism. As to Those who take *Trinity* and *Tritheism* for

* Ἄλλως τε ἕνα Θεὸν νομίσαι μὴ δυνάμεθα, ἐὰν μὴ ὄντως Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ καὶ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι πιστεύσωμεν. Hipp. Contr. Noet. p. 16.

I shall add his Doxology, *because it has but lately appear'd in the Greek, and so has been less took notice of.*

Οὗτος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἀνθρωπῳ δι' ἡμᾶς γεγονὼς, ᾧ πάντα ὑπέταξεν Πατήρ. αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ἅμα Πατρὶ καὶ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ, καὶ νῦν, καὶ ἀεὶ, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν. p. 20. Vol. 2. Fabric.

Synony-

Synonymous Terms, They may go on to value Themſelves upon it. They have *Jews*, *Pagans*, and *Hereticks*, Fifteen Hundred Years backwards, to countenance Them in it. It is ſufficient to have ſhown, that wiſer and better Men, the truly *Primitive* and *Catholick* Church, never thought it *Tritheiſm*; but condemn'd Thoſe that thought ſo.

Having taken off the Charge from our Doctrine, I come, next, to fix it upon Your's; where, I humbly conceive, it ought to lie. I do not pretend that you are *Tritheiſts*, in every Senſe; but in the ſame Senſe that the *Pagans* are called *Polytheiſts*, and in the Scripture-Senſe of the word, *God*, as explain'd and contended for, by your Selves. *One divine Perſon* is, with you, equivalent to *one God*; and Two, to two Gods; and Three, to three Gods: The Caſe is plain; The Conſequence unavoidable. One *Supreme*, and two *Inferior* Gods, is your avowed Doctrine: And, certainly, the aſſerting Three Gods (whether *coordinate*, or otherwiſe) is *Tritheiſm*; againſt the *firſt Commandment*, againſt the whole Tenor of Scripture, and the Principles of the primitive Church. It is, to me, an Inſtance of the ill effects of *vain Philoſophy*, and ſhows how the *Diſputer of this World* may get the better of the *Chriſtian*; when Men appear ſo much afraid of an *imaginary* Error in *Metaphyſicks*, and, to avoid it, run into a *real* One, againſt Scripture and Antiquity. You tell me, indeed,

that if I am positive in this, you'l bring both * *Ante-Nicene* and *Nicene-Fathers* against me. But, let me advise You to read Them (a second Time) over; and you'l see no Reason to be Sanguine in this Matter. The Doctor has cited some Passages from Them, and made Them seemingly speak his Sense; though, in the main, Doctrine, they are clearly against Him as I have observed † above. You appeal to these *Fathers* as Vouchers for you. But let us attend, however, to what you say.

The Antient Writers of the Church unanimously agree, that nothing but an absolute Equality and Co-ordination in God the Father and the Son, can make Them two Gods, and that the real Subordination of the Son to the Father preserves the Church from Poly-

* *The Sense of* Ante Nicene *and* Post-Nicene *Fathers, in Relation to* Tritheism, *may be seen in the following Passages.*

Ἐξῆς δ' ἂν εἰκότως λέγοιμι καὶ πρὸς διαιροῦντας καὶ κατατέμνοντας καὶ ἀναιροῦντας τὸ σεμνότατον κήρυγμα τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὴν μοναρχίαν εἰς τρεῖς δυνάμεις τινὰς καὶ μεμερισμένας ὑποστάσεις, καὶ θεότητας τρεῖς — — οἱ τρεῖς Θεοὺς τρόπον τινὰ κηρύττουσιν, εἰς τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις ξένας ἀλλήλων παντάπασι κεχωρισμένας διαιροῦντας τὴν ἁγίαν μονάδα. Dionys. Roman. apud Athanas. Vol. 1. p. 231.

Ὁ μὲν ἀρχὰς εἰσάγων δύο, δύο κηρύττει Θεούς· αὕτη Μαρκίωνος ἡ δυσσέβεια —— πάλιν ὁ Θεὸν ἀγένητον εἶναι λέγων, ἄλλον δὲ Θεὸν γένητον, δύο καὶ αὐτὸς λέγει Θεούς, διὰ τὴν τῆς οὐσίας διαφορὰν, ἣν βλασφήμως εἰσάγει· ὅπου δὲ μία μὲν ἡ Ἀρχὴ, ἓν δὲ τὸ ἐξ αὐτῆς γέννημα —— εἷς θεὸς, τελείας μὲν ἐν Πατρὶ τῆς θεότητος νοουμένης, τελείας δὲ καὶ ἐν υἱῷ τῆς πατρικῆς θεότητος ὑπαρχούσης. Athan. Contr. Sabell. Greg. p. 42.

Πῶς οὖν ἔσται μία θεότης, εἰ οὐκ ἔστι, καθ' ὑμᾶς Ὁμοούσιος τῷ Πατρὶ; εἰ γὰρ ἔχει τινὰ διάστασιν, ἤτοι διαφορὰν κατὰ τὴν τῆς οὐσίας λόγον, ἑτεροῖος μὲν ἂν εἴη Θεὸς ὁ υἱὸς, ἑτεροῖος δὲ ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ δύο κατὰ τοῦτο Θεοὺς ἀνάγκη λέγειν· ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀσεβὲς, καὶ οὐδὲ μέχρι μόνον ἀκοῆς παραδεκτόν. Ὁμοούσιος ἄρα τῷ Πατρὶ ὁ υἱός. οὕτω γὰρ τὸ ἓν θεότητι σωθήσεται. Cyril. Alex. Thesaur. p. 78.

† Qu. 5.

theism

theism, (*p.* 100.) In the next Page, You appeal to *Athanasius for the Sense of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, and to *Hilary* and *Basil*, in order to clear your Doctrine from the Charge of *Tritheism*; little imagining that These good and great Men have * condemn'd your Doctrine, as *Polytheism* and *Paganism*, over and over; as all know, that are any thing conversant in their Works. Well: But what have They said to countenance your Notion? This only: That *Unity of Principle* clears the *Church*'s Doctrine from the Charge of *Tritheism*. Not *your* Doctrine, not the *Arian* Doctrine; but the *Catholick* Doctrine. For since *Equality* of *Nature*, and *Unity* of *Principle* too, are both requisite; The *Catholicks* admitting the former (as their Adversaries well knew) had nothing farther needful to insist upon, in answer to the Charge of *Tritheism*, but the latter. Unity of Principle, and Sameness of Nature together might make two Persons *one God* (according to the unanimous Opinion of the Antients) but not either of them alone.

But now in respect to the *Arian* (that is, your Doctrine) the pretence of Unity of Principle is perfectly absurd. The Son is supposed a *Creature* of the *Father's*: If his being of, or from, the Father, in this Sense, makes Him *one God* with the Father, it will

* Athanas. Orat. 3. p. 565, 566. Hilar. p. 916. Basil. Ep. 70. pag. 863.

follow, that *Angels* or *Men*, or even Things inanimate, are one God with the Father alſo. Indeed, to do you juſtice, you do not ſo much as pretend, that *Unity* of *Principle*, or any Thing elſe can make Him *one God* with the Father. Which is enough to ſhow, how very widely you differ from the *Antients*, in the main point of All. They thought it neceſſary to aſſert, that *Father* and *Son* were Both *one God*. So *Irenæus*, *Athenagoras*, *Tertullian*, *Clement* of *Alexandria*, *Origen*, *Hippolytus*, *Lactantius*, and even *Euſebius* Himſelf, after ſome Debates upon it; as may appear from the Teſtimonies * before refer'd to: And of the *Poſt-Nicene Catholick* Writers, every body knows, that All to a Man contended for it. They thought that the *Divinity* of the Son could not be otherwiſe ſecured, and *Polytheiſm* at the ſame time avoided, than by aſſerting Father and Son to be *one God*; and They thought right. But what do you do? Or how can you contrive to clear your Scheme? We ask if the Son be *God*, as well as the Father? You ſay, Yes: How then is there but *one God?* Your Anſwer is, The Father is *ſupreme*, and therefore He, *ſingly*, is the *one God*. This is taking away what you gave us before, and retracting what you aſſerted of the *Son*. If *Supremacy* only makes a Perſon *God*, The Son is no God, upon your Principles: Or, if He is *God* notwithſtanding, then Father and Son are *two Gods*. Turn this over, as often as you pleaſe, you'l find

* Qu. 2. p. 22.

find it impossible to extricate your self from it. You can say only this; That you do not admit Two *supreme* Gods. That is very true: No more did the *Pagan* Polytheists, nor the Idolatrous *Samaritans*, nor Others condemn'd in Scripture for *Polytheism*. You stand pretty fair upon the Principles of *Philosophy*; and are not guilty of any manifest Error in *Metaphysicks*, upon this Article. But you are such a *Tritheist*, as upon Scripture-Principles, and upon the Principles of the *Catholick* Church, both * before and after the *Nicene-Council*, must stand condemn'd. Your Belief of the *Fathers* being for you, in this particular, is pure Fancy and Fiction; owing, I suppose, to your seeing only some Pieces of Them in Dr. *Clarke*. You can find but very little among Antients, which either directly or indirectly favors your Notion of a *supreme* and a *subordinate* God. They condemn'd it *implicitely*, in their Disputes with the *Pagans*, all along: And no sooner was it started in the Church, but the *Catholicks* were alarm'd at it; and immediately condemn'd it, as reviving of *Creature-Worship*, and restoring *Gentilism*, and Pagan *Polytheism*. Two Gods, a greater and a less, a Supreme and an Inferior, no Scripture, no sound Reason, no good *Catholick* ever Taught; no Church would have endured. A *separate*

* N. B. *I do not say that the* Ante-Nicene *Writers would have called the* Arian *Doctrine* Tritheism; *perhaps*, Blasphemy *rather. But They would have charg'd it with* Paganism (*see* Tertullian *above, p.* 54.) *which comes to the same with what the* Post-Nicenes *said of it.*

God from the Supreme, an *inferior created* God, would not only have been look'd upon as *Polytheiſm* and *Contradiction*, conſider'd in it ſelf; but as *Hereſy* and *Blaſphemy*, if underſtood of God and Chriſt.

To conclude this Head: If we underſtand the word, God, in the ſtrict Senſe, it is ridiculous to charge the *Arian* Scheme with *plurality* of Gods. But, if it be underſtood in the looſe popular Senſe, or in your own Senſe of it, it is equally ridiculous to deny it. Mr. *Nye*, who, you know, has ſtudied this Controverſy much and long, and is no Friend either to the truly *Catholick* Scheme, or *your*'s, condemning Both as *Tritheiſm*; is pleaſed however ſo far to give the Preference to the former, as to declare, that *the Arian Hereſy is only a more abſurd and leſs defenſible* Tritheiſm*. Of all the four Schemes which have been followed, the *Sabellian*, *Catholick*, *Arian*, and *Socinian*; The *Sabellian* only (which intirely *ungods* the *Son*, and *annihilates* the *Holy-Ghoſt*) ſtands perfectly clear of any Appearance of *Polytheiſm*. The *Catholick* appears chargeable, but really is not ſo: The *Arian* and *Socinian* both appear ſo, and are ſo; Wherefore a Charge of *Tritheiſm* muſt come from Them, with a very ill Grace. For, was the Charge really juſt, and were we weak enough to aſſert three *Co-ordinate* God's; yet even that could not be more repugnant to the

* *Explicat. of the Articles of Div. Unity*, p. 91.

whole

whole Drift, Scope, and Tenor of the Sacred Writ, than the admitting a *plurality* of Gods, *great* and *little*, *sovereign* and *inferior*, *infinite* and *finite*, *uncreated* and *created*, to receive our Addresses, and to be the Objects of our Love, Faith, Hope, Confidence, and religious Adoration.

Query XXIII.

Whether the Doctor's Notion of the Trinity be more clear and intelligible than the other?

The difficulty in the Conception of the Trinity is, how three Persons can be one God.

Does the Doctor deny that every one of the Persons, singly, is God? No: Does He deny that God is one? No: How then are Three one?

Does one and the same Authority, exercis'd by all, make Them one, numerically or individually one and the same God? That is hard to conceive how three distinct Beings, according to the Doctor's Scheme, can be individually one God, that is, three Persons one Person.

If therefore one God necessarily signifies but one Person, the Consequence is irresistible; *either that the Father is that one Person, and none else, which is downright* Sabellianism; *Or that the three Persons are three Gods.*

Thus the Doctor's Scheme is liable to the same difficulties with the other.

There is indeed one eaſy way of coming off, and that is, by ſaying that the Son and Holy-Spirit are neither of them God, in the Scripture-ſenſe of the Word. But this is cutting the Knot, inſtead of untying it; and is in effect to ſay, They are not ſet forth as divine Perſons in Scripture.

Does the Communication of divine Powers and Attributes from Father to Son, and Holy Spirit make Them one God, the Divinity of the two latter being the Father's Divinity? Yet the ſame difficulty recurs: For either the Son and Holy Ghoſt have diſtinct Attributes, and a diſtinct Divinity of their own, or They have not: If They have, They are (upon the Doctor's Principles) diſtinct Gods from the Father, and as much as Finite from Infinite, Creature from Creator, and then how are They one? If They have not, then, ſince They have no other Divinity, but that individual Divinity, and thoſe Attributes which are inſeparable from the Father's Eſſence, They can have no diſtinct Eſſence from the Father's; and ſo (according to the Doctor) will be one and the ſame Perſon, that is, will be Names only.

Q. *Whether This be not as unintelligible as the Orthodox Notion of the Trinity, and liable to the like Difficulties: A Communication of divine Powers and Attributes, without the Subſtance, being as hard to conceive,*

ceive, nay much harder, than a Communication of Both together?

YOU are pleased to say, that *had the Author at all understood Dr.* Clarke's *Books, He would not have offered* these Considerations, *They are such gross mistakes*, (p. 105.) It might be very pardonable to mistake the Doctor, who deals much in general and ambiguous Terms; and I am the more excusable, as mistaking on the tender and candid Side. I must own to you, I was not aware, that the Doctor had denied, *Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost, to be one God.* I did not apprehend, He would scruple to call Them all together *one God*; because That would be manifestly excluding *Son* and *Holy-Ghost* from the *one Godhead*; and then our dispute about his meaning, would be perfectly at an end. I should have been very unwilling to make so home a Charge, as That upon Him: But since you are a Friend, and declare in publick that this is his meaning, so it shall be hereafter. And now, I will not ask *how three Persons can be one God*, upon the Doctor's Principles; But I'll put the Question thus: *How can it be true (upon the Doctor's Principles) that every Person of the Trinity is God; and true likewise, that there is but one God?* The Question or Difficulty being thus fairly stated, I conceive, that my reasoning against the other, will, in the main, hold good against this too; only *muta-*

tis

tis mutandis. Now then, clear me up this Difficulty in the Doctor's Scheme, and free it from *Self-Contradiction*, if you are able. I have been searching diligently several Pages of your Answer, to see if I might find any thing like a Solution: But I perceive, at length, you was so wise as to drop it. You was to tell me How, notwithstanding that there are Three *divine Persons*; (that is, *Gods*, according to you) there is still but one God. But instead of this, you run wandring wide and far, to shew how Three may be *One*. What? Three Gods one God? That was what I ask'd; the rest is not pertinent, but foreign to the Point. Finding so little Satisfaction from you, in a Point so material, in the very pinch of the Question between the Doctor and Us, I thought proper to have recourse to the Doctor's Books again; to see if any thing could be found there to our present purpose.

I perceived, that * *Dominion and Authority*, according to Him, *make God to be God.* Upon this Principle, He supposes the Son, † *by nature truly God, having true divine Power and Dominion:* And He says, ‡ *The word, God, in Scripture, is always a relative word of Office, signifying personal Dominion.* The obvious Conclusion, from these Premises, is, that if *Dominion* and *Authority*, such as makes any Person *truly God*, be lodged in Three Per-

* Reply, *p.* 301. † Ib. *p.* 81.
‡ Ib. *p.* 290.

sons;

ſons; Thoſe Three Perſons, upon the Doctor's Principles, muſt be *three Gods*. The Doctor being ſenſible of this Difficulty in his Scheme, and not being able to ſolve it, nor willing to profeſs *three Gods*, tries to diſguiſe and elude it. He asks, * *why muſt three divine Beings, of neceſſity, be conceived as three Gods?* The Anſwer is very eaſy: Becauſe *three divine Beings*, is exactly the ſame, in other Words, with *three Gods*, upon his Principles; and becauſe every one of the Three is ſuppoſed to have *perſonal Dominion*, that very *Dominion* which is ſufficient to make a Perſon *truly God*; and ſuch as *makes God to be God*. † He goes on to diſtinguiſh the three Perſons by the Names of *God*, *Lord*, and *Holy Spirit*; as if He had forgot, or had no mind to own, that either of the two laſt is *God*. He proceeds: *They can no more truly be ſaid to be three Gods, than each of Them, ſingly, can be truly ſaid to be the God and Father of All, who is above all; which is the Apoſtle's Definition of the one ſupreme God.* But this is not to the Purpoſe; unleſs no one can be *God*, that is not the *ſupreme* God. If the Doctor ſays That, He contradicts Himſelf ſtrangely; having took a great deal of Pains to ſhow that the *Son*, tho' not the *ſupreme* God, is yet *truly* God, *having true divine Power and Dominion*. If He thinks the Apoſtle's Definition of *God* to be better than his own, why did He not ſtand to it?

* Reply, *p.* 222. † Ib. *p.* 223.

And

And then it would be ſeen plainly, that his meaning is, that no one can be *God* but the *Father*; which is making ſhort work with the Doctrine of the *divine* Trinity, and ſtriking out *Son* and *Holy-Ghoſt* at once. It is evident to a Demonſtration, that the three Perſons are, upon the Doctor's *Hypotheſis*, as *really* and *truly* three Gods, as that every one ſingly, is *God:* And therefore, either let Him ſay plainly, that there are three Gods; or that neither the Son, nor the Holy-Ghoſt is *God.* The Difficulty then ſtill remains unanſwer'd; how (upon the Doctor's Principles) three Perſons can be every one, ſingly, *God*; and yet Scripture ſay true, that there is but one *God.*

And now, I return to you again; whom I left inſtructing the Reader, very particularly, How *Three* may be *One*; *viz.* in *agreement* of Mind, in their joint *care of the Church*, in *Teſtimony*, &c. which might have been pertinent, had I been arguing from the Text, *I and my Father are One*; or from *Joh.* 5. 7. But your anſwering ſo copiouſly to what I did not ask, and ſlipping over the main Difficulty, looks as if you were more concern'd how to keep your Reader from the ſight of the Queſtion, than how to give Him any reaſonable Satisfaction. The firſt pertinent Thing I meet with from you, is in Page 108. where you charge me with a *manifeſt Error*, for ſuppoſing it *Sabellianiſm* to make the *one God* but *one Perſon*;

Person; namely, The Person of the Father. What I assert is, that it is *Sabellian* to say, that there is but One who is God, one *Person* only, instead of one *Nature:* Or to suppose the Godhead to be one single *Hypostasis*; or μονοπρόσωπον, a Father without his *Word* or *Spirit* eternally and essentially subsisting with Him, and from Him. This is what I maintain, and what you will not be able to disprove. But let us see how you go about it. *One God*, you say, *is one Person only*; *otherwise one Person could not be one God.* I answer, that no one Person is one God, *exclusively* of the other two Persons. You add, *if one God be two Persons or more, it is impossible for one Person to be God.* When we say one Person is *God*, we mean that He is a *divine Hypostasis*, *Deitatem habens*, as the Schools speak: But when we say God is three Persons, we understand it of the divine *Essence*, or *Substance:* So that the word *God* is sometimes taken *essentially*, and sometimes *personally*, which makes the Difference. You proceed: *The Defenders of the Scholastick Notion* (you mean the Defenders of the Trinity in Unity) *profess the Father alone, and distinct from the Son and Spirit, is God, or the one God.* Very true; in the *personal* Sense before mention'd, *distinct* from, not *exclusive* of, the Son and Holy-Spirit. In the same Sense, either of the other Persons is God, and the one God. There is a farther Reason, why the Father is *peculiarly*

and

and *eminently* ſtiled the *one God:* Not to exclude the other Perſons; but to ſignify his *priority* of Order, as Father, and as Fountain of all. Thus I have anſwer'd your Reaſons, which you are pleas'd to call *Demonſtration*; tho' it is manifeſt that, all along in your reaſoning, you take it for granted, that *God* is one Perſon only, and ſuppoſe the very Thing in Queſtion. You next proceed to confute my Aſſertion; that the making the one God but one Perſon, is *Sabellian.* And you ſay thus: *If by one Perſon, He means one intelligent Agent, He makes the* Sabellians *Catholicks, and condemns his own Friends for* Tritheiſts. I certainly mean a *real* Perſon, an *Hypoſtaſis*, no *mode*, *attribute*, or *property*, as you might eaſily have perceived. The charge of *Tritheiſm* I have ſufficiently anſwer'd before; and returned it to its proper Owners. I ſhall only add here, that each divine Perſon is an individual intelligent Agent: But as ſubſiſting in one undivided Subſtance, They are all together, in that reſpect, but one undivided intelligent Agent: And thus my Friends ſtand clear of *Tritheiſm.* You obſerve, that *Sabellius held one* Hypoſtaſis, *or divine Subſtance, in oppoſition to the Church, who profeſs'd three* Hypoſtaſes. Why did you not add, or *three divine* Subſtances, having render'd *Hypoſtaſis, divine Subſtance*, juſt before? Is not the reaſon of it viſible? You would not ſay that the *Sabellians* held one *Subſtance*, and the Church *three Subſtances*,

stances (tho' you do say it in effect) because the Thing is notoriously false. But taking advantage of the Ambiguity of the word, *Hypostasis*, sometimes used to signify *Substance*, and sometimes *Person*, you contrive a Fallacy. The Church never profess'd three *Hypostases* in any other Sense, but as they mean *three Persons*; nor would *Sabellius* have been censured for holding one *Hypostasis* only, had He meant *one Substance*. If you have a mind to see clearly in what Sense the *Catholicks* profess'd either three *Hypostases*, or one only, you may please to consult * *Athanasius* and † *Gregory Nazianzen*, refer'd to in the Margin.

The Truth is, the Church always profess'd *one Substance*; one eternal, immutable, uncreated *Substance*; and this they understood by, *God*. Notwithstanding, They believed the Son, and Holy-Spirit to be *substantially* God. *Praxeas*, *Noetus*, *Sabellius*, and others, not conceiving how *one Substance* could be more than *one Person*, ‡ one *Hypostasis*, innovated upon the Faith of the Church, and made one single

* Athanas. ad Antioch. p. 973.

† Greg. Nazianz. Orat. 22. p. 396. Orat. 32. p. 521.

‡ Origen *expresses the* Sabellian *Notion, very distinctly in the following Passage*

Μὴ διαφέρειν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ πατρὸς, ἀλλ' ἓν ὄντα μόνον ὄντος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑποκειμένου, τυγχάνοντος ἀμφοτέρους κατὰ πνας ἐπινοίας, ὃ κατὰ ὑπόστασιν λέγομεν πατέρα καὶ υἱόν. Orig. Com. in Joh. p. 185. Ed. Huet.

That is to say, The Sabellians *did not only make Father and Son* one in Essence (*as the Church did also*) *but they carried it so far as to make Them one* Subject, Suppositum, *or* Hypostasis, *having only a* nominal, *not a* real Distinction.

Hypo-

Hypoſtaſis the *one God*, with three Names. You tell us, with great Aſſurance, that *this never was, nor could be Sabellianiſm*, (*p.* 109.) To which I ſhall only ſay; Read, and you will find. You add farther, that *the one God is one Perſon only, and the Father that Perſon*; And that this is the *Aſſertion of St.* Paul. We will ſee to St. *Paul* preſently; in the mean while, I again tell you, that this is the very Eſſence of *Sabellianiſm*, and the Doctrine of * *Paul* of *Samoſata* (as hath been obſerved to you above) and for which He was condemn'd by the Church. Your pretence from the Apoſtle's Words, (*To us there is but one God, even the Father*) has been ſufficiently anſwer'd under the former Queries. I ſhall only obſerve here, that the Text mention'd is much ſtronger againſt the Doctor and your Self, than againſt Us. For how can You, after ſo *plain* and *expreſs* a Text to the contrary, pretend that the *Son* alſo is *God to us*, really and truly God, and in the Scripture-Senſe of the word, *God*? Whether, think you, do We, who make Him *eſſentially* the *ſame God* with that one, and ſuppoſe but *one God* in all, more flatly contradict St. *Paul*; or You who make *two Gods*, and in the ſame *relative* Senſe, in which St. *Paul* is ſuppoſed to uſe the word, *God*? To take up your own Words, upon this very occaſion; You *will, I truſt, be aſhamed when you con-*

* Ἵνα εἷς εἴη, φησὶν, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντα Θεὸς ὁ πατήρ. Athan. Contr. Apollinar. l. 2. p. 942.

ſider,

sider, that you plainly falsify St. Paul. He says, there is *but one God*, even the *Father*: But You say, there are more Gods than one; and particularly, that the *Son* is *God* also, God *to us*. How come you off of this? By the help of a *Distinction*, I suppose: And so can We; by a *Distinction* much older, and much better warranted than Your's; and therefore, be so kind as either to take some part of the *Shame* with us; or else to acquit Both. You proceed to acquaint us, that the *Father is the only true God* *. Very good: And do not the Doctor and You tell us, notwithstanding, that the Son is *true God*, having *true divine Power* and *Dominion*? If You can reconcile *two true Gods*, with the Doctrine of that Text; sure, We need not despair, nor have any thing to fear from that Text, who agree so far with it already (more than You) as to acknowledge but One God. We can give a Reason why the Son was tacitely included, being so intimately united to the Father, as partaker of the same *divine* Nature: But that any *Creature* should not be excluded from being God, or that there should be two Gods, notwithstanding the Text, must appear very strange. After this, you have two or three Subtilties. The *Father*, you say, will be but a *third Part*. You might, in this way, revive all the Impertinencies of *Aetius*, and throw them before *English* Readers. I refer

* Pag. 110.

you to * St. *Auſtin*, in the Margin, for an Anſwer. Let me deſire you not to give ſo great a looſe to your Fancy, in divine Things: You ſeem to conſider every thing under the Notion of Extenſion, and ſenſible Images. A reverential Silence may well become Us in ſo awful a Subject, in which Imagination has nothing to do, and of which our moſt refined and elevated Thoughts are infinitely unworthy. But to proceed: You add, *if Father, Son, and Holy-Ghoſt are the only true God, then they are the Father.* But if the *only true God*, may be ſometimes uſed in a *perſonal*, ſometimes in an *eſſential* Senſe, there is no force in this Reaſoning. I might retort the Argument upon You, who, in your way of conceiving, apply the Phraſe of *one God*, ſometimes to one *Part*, ſometimes to another, and ſometimes to the *whole*, almoſt in the ſame manner, as We do to *One*, or to all the three *Perſons:* But I am weary of trifling.

You ask me, *wherein the preſent Schola-*

* Putas Deum Patrem cum Filio & Spiritu Sancto unum Deum eſſe non poſſe: Times enim ne Pater Solus non ſit unus Deus, ſed *pars Unius Dei* qui conſtat ex *Tribus:* Noli timere, nulla ſit partium in Deitatis unitate diviſio. In Trinitate — quæ Deus eſt, & Pater Deus eſt, & Filius Deus eſt, & Spiritus Sanctus Deus eſt, & Simul Hi Tres unus Deus: nec hujus Trinitatis *pars* eſt unus, nec major pars duo quam unus eſt ibi, nec majus aliquid ſunt omnes quam ſinguli: quia *Spiritalis* non *Corporalis* eſt magnitudo. *Auguſt. Contr. Maxim.* l. 2. c. 10. p. 697, 698.

Pater & Filius & Spiritus Sanctus, & propter *individuam* Deitatem *Unus* Deus eſt, & propter uniuſcujuſque *proprietatem* tres *perſonæ* ſunt, & propter ſingulorum *Perfectionem Partes* unius Dei *non ſunt.* Id. ibid. p. 699.

ſtick-

ſtick-Notion diſagrees with the Sabellian? I anſwer, in admitting three *real* ſubſiſting Perſons. But ſince you are ſo often charging us with *Sabellianiſm*, it may be proper to obſerve here, how near akin the *Sabellians* and *Arians* are to each other, Both, as it were, growing of the ſame Stock.

1. In the firſt Place, Both ſeem to ſuppoſe or take for granted, that if the *modus*, or *manner*, be unintelligible, the Thing it ſelf is incredible.

2. Both agree in the fundamental Principle of *Hereſy*, that one Subſtance, or Being, can be only one *real* Perſon, or *Hypoſtaſis*. As *Neſtorius* and *Eutyches*, tho' taking different ways, yet proceeded upon the ſame Bottom, that two *Natures* could not make one *Perſon* in Chriſt: So *Sabellius* and *Arius*, before Them, tho' differing in the laſt reſult, yet ſet out upon the ſame Principle; That two *real* Perſons cannot be one *Being*, or *Subſtance*.

3. In Conſequence of their prime Poſition, Both conſpire to diſcard, in *reality*, the Son and the Holy-Ghoſt from the *One true Godhead*; looking upon it as *Tritheiſm* to make the Perſons *real*, and *divine* too. One *Hypoſtaſis* in the *Godhead* is all that either of Them admits; both *Judaizing*, as * *Gregory Nyſſen* juſtly obſerves, in that reſpect: And the *Sabellian*'s Τριάνυμος, (or God with three Names)

* Ὁν γὰρ Σαβέλλιος λέγει Τριώνυμον τῶτον Εὐνομιος Ὀνομάζει Ἀγέννητον. Greg. Nyſſ. Contr. Eunom. p. 676.

anſwers to the *Arian*'s Ἀγέννητος, *Self-exiſtent*, or *Unbegotten* God. Thus far they amicably agree; let us next obſerve where They differ.

Suppoſing Them fix'd and ſettled in their preliminary Principle, it is manifeſt that the *Word* and *Spirit* muſt either be *Names* only, or, if *real* diſtinct Perſons, *Creatures*. The *Sabellians* were at liberty to chuſe this, or that; But, finding Scripture run high, and Tradition ſtrong for the *Divinity* of the *Word* and *Holy-Spirit*, They made choice of the former; interpreting *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy-Ghoſt*, as different Names of one and the ſame *Hypoſtaſis*, or *real* Perſon. By this, they effectually guarded againſt the ſuppos'd *Tritheiſm* of the *Catholicks*, as well as againſt Pagan *Polytheiſm*; and, being wiſe Men ſo far, ſecured the Point which They aim'd at. The *Arians*, who came after (and who, as I before ſaid, ſet out upon the ſame preliminary Principles) finding that the *Sabellian Confuſion* of Perſons had been utterly routed, baffled, and exploded by all good Catholicks, had really no Option left; but either to make the Son and Holy-Spirit *Creatures*, or give up their *Preliminaries*. Accordingly, They took the way which the *Sabellians* had left Them; and were very unhappy in this particular, that, endeavoring to avoid one kind of *Tritheiſm*, They fell into Another.

The *Arian* Scheme, beſides it's failing in it's principal Deſign of avoiding *Polytheiſm*, has many

many real and great Difficulties; being as well too *high* for some Texts, as too *low* for others; which the *Catholicks*, or *Sabellians* can much better deal with. Hence, I suppose, it was, that the *Unitarians*, at the Beginning of the Reformation, having modestly begun with * *Arianism*; for the most part, settled into *Socinianism*, which is near to *Sabellianism:* And our English *Unitarians*, who for acuteness of Wit and subtilty of Thought have not been inferior to any of their Brethren, have been still refining upon the *Socinian* Scheme (which had struck upon *Ditheism*, in like manner as the *Arian* had upon *Tritheism*) and have brought it still nearer to *Sabellianism*. After all, when Men have run their Course from *Orthodoxy* to *Arianism*, from *Arianism* to *Socinianism*, and from thence to *Sabellianism*; if They will but give themselves leave to reflect and look back, They may perhaps perceive, at length, that *Catholicism*, is the only *Scriptural*, as well as the *Antient* Scheme; liable to the fewest Difficulties, and best guarded against Objections. It is therefore no wonder that the Bulk of Christians, learned and unlearned, have, for as many Centuries upwards as we have any clear Records extant, espoused it. It is an easy matter for Men of Wit and Fancy to find fault with Any Thing: But it requires Thought and Judgment to settle Things upon their true Bottom. Let Those who are displeased with the *received*

* Socin. Contr. Erasm. Johan. p. 496.

Doctrine, ſhow us a Better; and make any other conſiſtent Scheme (conſiſtent with Scripture and with it Self) if They can. Wiſe and good Men will be always willing to Reform, if there be Cauſe for it: But they will not be forward to pull down what appears to be founded on a Rock, in order only to build upon the Sand. It is ſome Satisfaction to the *Trinitarians* to obſerve, how long ſome great Wits have been new-modelling Chriſtianity; and have not yet been able to agree in any one certain Scheme. The *Arians* fall upon the *Sabellians*, and the *Sabellians* again upon Them: One defends the *Perſonality*, and the other the *Divinity* of the Λόγος, or *Word*, and cannot yet be brought to any Agreement. * Betwixt Them, the Principles of the Catholick Church are ſupported, and They condemn each other, in the very Things which the Church condemns in Both. If I may give a Judgment of the two Schemes, the *Sabellian* appears to be the neater of the Two, and moſt conſiſtent with it ſelf: The *Arian* is more pious and modeſt, tender of degrading the Son of God too far. As Men grow bolder and more learned in *Hereſy*, They will, very probably, be drawing nearer and nearer to the *Sabellians*. Two of the ableſt and acuteſt Men of the preſent *Unitarians* (one Here, the other Abroad) are Both in the *Sabellian* way: And

* Uterque Hoſtis Eccleſiæ res Eccleſiæ agit: Dum *Sabellius* Deum ex natura in operibus prædicat; Hi vero, ex Sacramento Fidei, Filium Dei confitentur. *Hil.* p. 919.

as

as They have given Proofs of their Learning, ſo have they ſufficiently ſhown their *Boldneſs* alſo, by treating ſo ſublime and tremendous a Subject, in the way of Scoff and Ridicule. To return: You are pleaſed to ſay, that you *have anſwer'd for Dr.* Clarke's *Notion not being* Sabellian, *and have proved that it is not* Tritheiſtick. But give me leave to ſay, that you are deceived in Both: The Ground is *Sabellian*, and the Super-ſtructure *Tritheiſtick*; and, the whole contrived in ſuch a way, as to hang looſely together.

It is obvious, at firſt ſight, that the true *Arian* or *Semi-Arian* Scheme (which you would be thought to come up to at leaſt) can never tolerably ſupport it ſelf, without taking in the *Catholick* Principle of a *Human Soul* to join with the *Word*. If you come thus far, it will then be eaſy to perceive that the *Sabellian* Scheme is the ſimpler and plainer; beſides that it better anſwers the *high* Things ſpoken of the *Word*; in reſpect of which your Scheme is as much too *low*, as before too *high*. But then again, the Arguments for the diſtinct *perſonality* of the *Word* and Holy Spirit, bear ſo full and ſtrong, that there will appear a Neceſſity for taking in another *Catholick* Principle; and That will compleatly anſwer all. And why then ſhould not the *Catholick* Doctrine (ſo apparently neceſſary to make Scripture conſiſtent) be admitted? The Caſe, in few words, appears to be only this. You cannot underſtand *how*

Three can be *One*; you see no reason, *a priori*, why, if the Son and Holy Spirit be *Co-eval* and *Consubstantial*. They should not be *Co-ordinate* too; you *know not* why the Father might not as well be said to be *begotten*, as to *beget*; to *be sent*, as to *send*, or the like. Very true: But you *may see* a Reason, *a priori*, why Creatures, of yesterday, may not be able to search the *deep Things of God:* You *may know* how well it becomes Them to submit their Fancies, or Presumptions, to divine Revelation; content to *see* through *a Glass darkly*, till the Time come to know God more perfectly, and to *see Him as He is*. This may be a sufficient Answer to a pious and humble Mind, in all Cases of this Nature; where the difficulty is owing only to our imperfect and inadequate Conception of Things.

I was obliged to pass over some Remarks you had in your Notes *, for the sake of Method: But it will not be too late to consider Them here. I had made no use of *Joh.* 10. 30. (*I and my Father are one*) but you had a mind to bring it in, to let us know how well you could answer it, from the *primitive Writers*. I am always willing to defend those good Men, and to rescue Them out of the Hands of Those, who either knowingly, or ignorantly abuse Them. You begin thus, Triumphantly: *The Defenders of the Scholastick Explication of the Trinity in Unity, tho' They pretend*

* Pag. 106.

much

much that the moſt Antient Writers of the Church are on their ſide, yet, in expreſſing their Notion of the Unity in the divine Perſons, They do not only leave Scripture and Reaſon, but plainly run againſt the whole Stream of Antiquity *alſo. The Text on which they ſo much rely* (Joh. 10. 30.) *is underſtood by* Tertullian *Himſelf of the Unity of Love, and Conſent, and Power.* You go on to cite *Tertullian*, and others, from Dr. *Clarke*. But, Writers in a Cauſe, are very often known to repreſent Things by halves. You ſhall ſee, preſently, what little Reaſon you have to talk of the *whole Stream of Antiquity*. The Text, which you ſpeak of, has all along been made uſe of by the *Catholicks*, in two Reſpects; firſt, in Proof of our Lord's *real* Divinity, againſt as many as denied it; and ſecondly, in Proof of his *real* Diſtinction from the Father, againſt the *Noetians* or *Sabellians*. There was very little occaſion to inſiſt much upon *Unity* of *Subſtance*, with thoſe who had carried *Unity of Subſtance* ſo high, as to make one *Hypoſtaſis*. It might be ſufficient, in diſpute with thoſe Men, to obſerve that That Text did by no means prove an *Identity* of *Perſon*, unleſs *Paul* and *Apollos* were one Perſon, which is abſurd. Whatever the Text might otherwiſe prove, it certainly did not prove, what the *Sabellians* pretended, an *Unity* of *Perſon*. This the *Poſt-Nicene* Fathers frequently obſerve, againſt the *Sabellians*

(as

(as the *Ante-Nicene* had done before) though, at the ſame time, That Text might be of good uſe againſt the *Arians*; as it had been all along againſt the *Impugners* of Chriſt's *Divinity*. For your clearer Apprehenſion of this Matter, I ſhall ſet down, * in Two diſtinct Columns, the Sentiments of the primitive Writers, on this

* *Againſt Impugners of Chriſt's Divinity.*	*Againſt* Sabellians.
TERTULLIAN.	TERTULLIAN.
Qui Tres Unum ſunt, non Unus, quomodo dictum eſt, *Ego & Pater Unum ſumus.* Ad Subſtantiæ Unitatem, non ad numeri Singularitatem. *Adv. Prax.* c. 25.	*Unum* dicit Neutrali verbo, quod non pertinet ad Singularitatem ſed an *unitatem*, ad Conjunctionem, ad dilectionem Patris, qui Filium diligit, & ad obſequium Filii, qui Voluntati Patris obſequitur. *Unum ſumus*, dicens, quos æquat & jungit. *Adv. Prax.* c. 22.
NOVATIAN.	NOVATIAN.
Quod ſi, cum nullius Hominis Hæc vox eſſe poſſet, *Ego & Pater unum ſumus*, hanc vocem de Conſcientia *Divinitatis* Chriſtus Solus edicit —— merito Deus eſt Chriſtus. *c.* 13. Si Homo tantummodo Chriſtus, quid eſt quod dicit, *Ego & Pater unum ſumus*, Si non & *Deus* eſt, & Filius, qui idcirco unum poteſt dici, dum ex Ipſo eſt, & dum Filius ejus eſt, & dum ex ipſo naſcitur, & dum ex ipſo proceſſiſſe reperitur, per quod & *Deus* eſt. *c.* 23.	Quia dixit *unum*, intelligant Hæretici quia non dixerit *unus*. *Unum* enim neutraliter poſitum Societatis Concordiam, non Unitatem Perſonæ ſonat —— merito unum ſit Pater & Filius per concordiam, & per amorem, & per dilectionem —— Novit hanc concordiæ Unitatem & Apoſtolus *Paulus* cum Perſonarum diſtinctione —— *Qui plantat & qui rigat unum ſunt.* Quis autem non intelligat alterum eſſe *Apollo*, alterum *Paulum*, non eundem atque ipſum *Apollo* pariter & *Paulum*. c. 22.
ORIGEN.	ORIGEN.
Λεκτέον δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο, ὅτι εἴπερ νενοήκει ὁ Κέλσος τὸ, Ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν — οὐκ ἂν ᾤετο ἡμᾶς καὶ	Τὸν πατέρα, — καὶ τὸν υἱὸν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ὄντα δύο τῇ ὑποστάσει πράγματα, ἓν δὲ τῇ ὁμονοίᾳ, καὶ συμ- ἄλλον

ἄλλον θεραπεύειν παρὰ τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεόν. — ἕνα οὖν Θεὸν ὡς ἀποδεδώκαμεν, τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν θεραπεύομεν. Contr. Cels. l. 8. p. 386.

DIONYSIUS ROM.

Οὔτε (χρὴ) ποιήσει κωλύειν τὸ ἀξίωμα καὶ τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τοῦ κυρίου — — ἡνῶσθαι δὲ τῷ Θεῷ τῶν ὅλων τὸν λόγον, ἐγὼ γάρ, φησι, καὶ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν. Ap. Athan. p. 232.

HIPPOLYTUS.

Οὐ δύο Θεοὺς λέγω, ἀλλ' ὡς φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, ἢ ὡς ὕδωρ ἐκ πηγῆς, ἢ ὡς ἀκτῖνα ἀπὸ ἡλίου, δύναμις γὰρ μία ἡ ἐκ τοῦ παντὸς, τὸ δὲ πᾶν πατὴρ, ἐξ οὗ δύναμις λόγος. c. 11.

ALEXANDER. ALEX.

Ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἓν ἐσμὲν. ὅπερ φησὶν ὁ κύριος, οὐ πατέρα ἑαυτὸν ἀναγορεύων. οὐδὲ τὰς τῇ ὑποστάσει δύο φύσεις μίαν εἶναι σαφηνίζων. ἀλλ' ὅτι τὴν πατρικὴν ἐμφέρειαν ἀκριβῶς πέφυκε σώζειν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς, τὸν κατὰ πάντα ὁμοιότητα αὐτοῦ ἐκ φύσεως ἀπομαξάμενος, καὶ ἀπαράλλακτος εἰκὼν τοῦ πατρὸς τυγχάνων, καὶ τοῦ πρωτοτύπου ἔκτυπος χαράκτηρ. Theod. E. H. l. 1. c. 4. p. 15.

EPIPHANIUS.

Καὶ πρὸς τούτους μὲν τοὺς νομίζοντας ἀλλότριον εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ πατρὸς —— λέγει, ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν —— διὰ τὸ εἶναι ἐν μιᾷ ἑνότητι θεότητος, καὶ ἐν μιᾷ γνώμῃ καὶ δυνάμει. p. 488. Hær. 57.

CYRIL. HIEROS.

Ἓν διὰ τὸ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα ἀξίωμα ἐπειδὴ Θεὸς Θεὸν ἐγέννησεν. Ἓν διὰ τὸ κατὰ τὴν βασιλείαν — ἓν διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν εἶναι διαφωνίαν ἢ διάστασιν. — Ἓν διὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἄλλα χριστοῦ δημιουργήματα καὶ ἄλλα πατρὸς· μία γὰρ ἡ πάντων δημιουργία. p. 142, 143. Ox. Ed.

φωνίᾳ, καὶ τῇ ταυτότητι τοῦ βουλήματος· ὡς τὸν ἑωρακότα τὸν υἱὸν (ὄντα ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης, καὶ χαρακτῆρα τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ) ἑωρακέναι ἐν αὐτῷ ὄντι εἰκόνι τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν Θεόν. Contr. Cels. l. 8. pag. 386.

HIPPOLYTUS.

Οὐκ εἶπεν ὅτι ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν εἰμι, ἀλλ' ἕν ἐσμεν. τὸ γάρ ἐσμεν οὐκ ἐφ' ἑνὸς λέγεται, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ δύο πρόσωπα ἔδειξεν, δύναμιν δὲ μίαν — — τὴν δόξαν ἣν ἔδωκάς μοι, ἔδωκα αὐτοῖς ἵνα ὦσιν ἕν, καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἕν — — τί πρὸς ταῦτα ἔχουσι λέγειν οἱ Νοητιανοί; μὴ πάντες ἓν σῶμά ἐστιν κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν, ἢ τῇ δυνάμει καὶ τῇ διαθέσει τῆς ὁμοφρονίας ἕν γινόμεθα; τὸν αὐτὸν δὴ τρόπον ὁ παῖς — — ὡμολόγησεν εἶναι ἐν τῷ πατρὶ δυνάμει, διαθέσει· εἷς γὰρ νοῦς πατρὸς ὁ παῖς. Contr. Noet. c. 7. pag. 11.

EPIPHANIUS.

Πρὸς δὲ τοὺς νομίζοντας αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι υἱὸν διὰ τὸ εἰρηκέναι, ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν λέγει, ποίησον αὐτοὺς ἵνα ὦσιν ἕν καθὼς ἐγὼ καὶ σὺ ἕν ἐσμεν, ἵνα καταισχύνῃ Νοητὸν καὶ τὴν αὐτοῦ σχολὴν, παραγαγὼν εἰς τὸ μέσον τὴν τῶν μαθητῶν ἕνωσιν. Πῶς γὰρ ἠδύνατο Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης, καὶ οἱ καθεξῆς εἶναι ἕν ὡς κατὰ συναλοιφήν; p. 488.

CYRIL. HIEROSOL.

Οὐκ εἶπε ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν εἰμι, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν, ἵνα μήτε ἀπαλλοτριώσωμεν, μήτε συναλοιφὴν υἱοπατορίας ἐργασώμεθα. p. 142.

Head;

Head; that you may perceive how They defended ſuch an *Unity* as we maintain, at the ſame Time that they ſtrenuouſly oppoſed the *Sabellians*. I ſhall make particular Remarks upon the Authors, ſingly, as I paſs along; and afterwards throw in ſome general Obſervations.

To begin with *Tertullian:* You will obſerve, that He interprets the Text *expreſly* of *Unity* of *Subſtance*, in one Citation: And He is to be ſo underſtood in the other, had you but thought how to conſtrue *Unitatem*, as you ſhould have done. I ſuppoſe, *Unity* of *Love*, *Conſent*, and *Power* may very well follow, after ſo good a Foundation laid for it. *Tertullian* elſewhere intimates the ſtrict and inviolable Harmony of the three Perſons, reſolving it into *Unity* of *Subſtance* *.

Novatian is your next Author: You may pleaſe to obſerve, how abſurd He thinks it would have been for any meer Man to have ſaid, I and my Father *are one*. And why ſo? Might not there be Unity of *Will*, *Conſent*, *Authority*, between God and Man? Undoubtedly there might. Well then, *Novatian* did conceive the Text to ſpeak of Unity of *Love*, &c. but *Equality* of *Nature preſuppoſed:* For even *Paul* and *Apollos* were not of a *different* Nature; one was as *truly Man*, as the other: And ſo, if Chriſt was *truly* God, as well as the Father, He might ſay, *I and my Father are*

* Tam conſortibus Subſtantiæ Patris. *Contr. Prax.* c. 3.

one.

one. This is plainly *Novatian*'s Senſe, in the Citations of the firſt Column; and it is very conſiſtent with the other, in the oppoſite Column. All That Unity of *Conſent*, *Love*, &c. is founded upon, and reſolves into *Unity* of *Subſtance* and *Principle*, according to this Writer.

Origen comes next. I have ſet againſt Him a Paſſage of *Dionyſius* of *Rome*, who quotes the Text in Confirmation of what He had juſt before ſaid, that we ought not by any means to undervalue the ſuper-eminent Dignity of the Son, by ſuppoſing Him a *Creature*. As to *Origen* particularly, it is to be conſidered, that, if He had reſolved the Unity of Godhead, in that Paſſage, into Unity of *Conſent*, mentioning no other; yet no certain Argument could be drawn from thence, that He held no other; any more than from the Paſſages of *Novatian* and *Tertullian* before cited. Had They been left *ſingle*, They had been liable to the ſame Charge; and yet it ſeems meerly accidental that They were not. Authors do not always ſpeak their whole Thoughts upon a particular occaſion; but are content only to ſay as much as the occaſion requires. *Origen* was guarding againſt the *Sabellian* abuſe of the Text, and his Thoughts were turned to That chiefly. However, in That very place, He made ſo much Uſe of the Text, as from thence to infer, that Father and Son are *one God*, and *one Object* of Worſhip; which, to any one who is acquainted

acquainted with *Origen*'s Principles in That Book, must appear to denote the *divine* and *uncreated* Nature of the Son; and consequently a *substantial* Unity betwixt Him and the Father: Besides, that this is farther intimated, in the Passage cited, by the Words, ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης, and χαρακτῆρα τῆς ὑποστάσεως, which seem to have been added to qualify the former; and are hardly pertinent but on some such Supposition. To confirm which, please to compare *Origen* with *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria* his Comment on the same Text, and you'l find Them very nearly the same; which is sufficient to acquit *Origen* of any Suspicion of *Arianizing*, in this Point.

I come next to *Hippolytus*, who has but lately appear'd, and whom neither the Doctor nor You have took notice of. He argues, against the *Sabellians*, in the very same way with *Tertullian*, *Novatian*, and *Origen*: But then, in the other Citation oppositely placed, He clearly resolves the Unity of the Godhead into Unity of *Substance* and *Principle*. But besides this, it deserves your special Notice, That while He speaks of Unity of *Will*, and *Concord* (admitting a kind of Parallel between the Union of Christians, and the Union of God and Christ) He clearly signifies how infinitely more perfect the latter is; resolving it into this, that the Son is the νοῦς πατρὸς, the Living and Substantial *Mind*, or *Thought* of the Father. This then is the Case: There is an Unity of Concord, and

and Harmonious Love, founded upon Unity of Subſtance: And the words, *I and my Father are one*, Expreſs both the Unity it ſelf, and the Foundation of it. *Paul* and *Apollos* were one in Heart and Will, in ſuch Meaſure and Degree as They were capable of: And ſo God and Chriſt are *one* likewiſe; but by an Union infinitely more perfect, and upon an infinitely higher Foundation. You need not be told, that καθὼς often ſignifies not an *exact Equality*, but a *general Similitude:* The Remark is juſt; and, as it is at other times urged againſt us, ſo let me here claim the Benefit of it.

I have added to the Number, Two *Poſt-Nicene* Writers, *Epiphanius* and the elder *Cyril*; which are enough to ſhow that the ſame way of reaſoning againſt the *Sabellians* (which prevailed before the *Nicene-Council*) obtain'd likewiſe afterwards. Some are apt to triumph extremely, if They can but find any the leaſt Difference between the *Ante-Nicene* and *Poſt-Nicene* Writers. If there be but a Text or Two differently interpreted, a ſolemn Remark is made upon it; and ſometimes a trifling Note of ſome obſcure *Scholiaſt*, or any *Imaginary* Difference (having no Foundation but the *Writer*'s Ignorance, or Negligence in comparing) is improved into an Argument of *Change of Doctrine*; and *Athanaſianiſm* is made the Name for what has been conſtantly held in the *Chriſtian* Church. If there be occaſion to ſpeak of the Things ſeemingly Derogatory to the Honour

of

of the Son (his being *Subordinate*; his referring all Things to the Father, as *Head*, *Root*, *Fountain*, *Cauſe*; his *executing* the Father's Will, and the like) Or of a *real* Diſtinction between Father and Son (as their being δύο ἀριθμῷ, *duæ Res*, or one of them, ἀριθμῷ ἕτερος, that is, *perſonally* diſtinct from the other) then only *Ante Nicene* Fathers are quoted; as if the *Poſt-Nicene* did not teach the very ſame Doctrine: But if any thing, which ſeems to make more for the Honour of the Son, be mention'd (as His being *uncreated*, *eternal*, *one God* with the Father, *Creator* of all Things, and the like) this is to be repreſented as the Doctrine of the *Poſt-Nicene* Fathers only; tho' nothing is more evident than that They varied not a Tittle, in any material Point of Doctrine, from their Predeceſſors; but only preſerved, as became Them, with an upright Zeal, the true Faith of Chriſt, *which was once delivered to the Saints*.

To return. It is needleſs almoſt, to take notice of other Teſtimonies: Thoſe in the Margin are ſufficient to ſhow the true and conſtant Senſe of the Chriſtian Church. The * Doctor quotes *Baſil* and *Chryſoſtom*, as ſaying Father and Son were One, κατὰ δύναμιν: And, leſt the Reader ſhould underſtand what thoſe Fathers meant by κατὰ δύναμιν, He cuts *Chryſoſtom* ſhort; whoſe words immediately following (εἰ δὲ ἡ δύναμις ἡ αὐτὴ, εὔδηλον ὅτι καὶ ἡ οὐσία)

* Pag. 102.

ſhow

ſhow that He meant by δύναμις, not the ſame *Authority*, but the ſame inherent, eſſential, *omnipotent* Power.

Athenagoras's δυνάμει may be rightly interpreted by *Hippolytus* before cited; or by *Chryſoſtom*; or by Himſelf, in ſeveral Places where He is clear for the *Conſubſtantiality*. *Juſtin Martyr*'s Sentiments have been explain'd above; and the *Council* of *Antioch*'s Expreſſion (τῇ συμφωνίᾳ) is vindicated by * *Hilary*; who Himſelf may be readily underſtood by ſuch as remember how the primitive Fathers held the Holy-Ghoſt to be, as it were, *Vinculum Trinitatis*, and ſometimes *Amor Patris & Filii*; as the Son Himſelf is alſo ſtiled *Charitas ex Charitate*, by † *Origen*. Theſe Things I can only hint to the intelligent Reader, having already exceeded the Bounds of a Digreſſion.

* Pag. 1170, 1171.
† Pamph. Apol. p. 235. Ed. Bened.

QUERY XXIV.

Whether Gal. 4. 8. *may not be enough to determine the diſpute betwixt Us; ſince it obliged the Doctor to confeſs that Chriſt is* * by Nature truly God, as truly as Man is by Nature truly Man.

He equivocates, indeed, there, as uſual. For, He will have it to ſignify, that Chriſt is God by Nature, only as having, by that Nature which He derives from the Father, true divine Power and Dominion: That is, He is truly God by Nature, as having a Nature diſtinct from, and inferior to God's, wanting † the moſt eſſential Character of God, *Self-exiſtence. What is this but trifling with Words, and playing faſt and looſe?*

IN Anſwer hereto, you begin: *Will the Queriſt inſiſt upon it, that the Son cannot be God by Nature, unleſs He be Self-exiſtent?* And you proceed: *I can aſſure Him the learnedeſt, even of his own Friends, are aſhamed of this; and there are few ſo hardy, as directly to affirm it.* But, have a little Patience, and I'll endeavor to make you eaſy. Where were your Thoughts? Where were your Eyes? Either I am ſtrangely miſtaken, or the Line, which offended you ſo grievouſly, was

* Reply, p. 81. † Reply, p. 92.

ſcored

ſcored underneath; and pag. 92. of the Doctor's Reply referr'd to, as you find now: And my charging the Doctor with *playing faſt and looſe*, immediately after, might have been a ſufficient Intimation of my meaning. Whether I think the Son *Self exiſtent* or no, is not now the Queſtion. I took hold of the Doctor's Expreſſion, charg'd Him with *faſt and looſe*, that is, ſaying and unſaying, contradicting Himſelf. If *Self-exiſtence* be the *moſt eſſential Character* of God, it ſeems to me to follow, that the *Son*, who by the Doctor's Confeſſion wants that *Character*, cannot be *truly* and by *Nature* God, any more than any thing can be *truly* and by *Nature* Man, without the *eſſential Character* of Man. As to my own part; I never pretend that *Self-exiſtence* is an *eſſential* Character of God: You might have conſider'd that we deny it abſolutely; we ſuppoſe it merely *negative*, and call it a *perſonal* Character. *Neceſſary-exiſtence* is an *eſſential* Character, and belongs equally to *Father* and *Son*: If That be what you mean by *Self-exiſtence*, then That alſo belongs to Both. Explain your ſelf, and deal not ſo much in *ambiguous* Terms, which we have juſt Reaſon to complain of. The Doctor knows how *Self-exiſtent*, by Cuſtom, ſounds among common Readers; and that denying the Son to be *Self-exiſtent*, may be thought by many the ſame Thing with denying Him to be *God*. Had He pleaſed, in his Tranſlations of ἀγέννητος, and elſe-where, to ſay oftner, *unbegotten* or *un-*

derived, instead of *Self-existent*, it would have been kind towards his Readers, and perhaps as kind to Himself: For it will be always thought as much beneath a *grave* Writer to take the poor Advantage of an *equivocal* Word, as it is a disparagement to any Cause to be served by it. But to proceed.

You wanted, it seems, to bring in a parcel of Quotations, which you might as well have referr'd to only, where They * lie, and may be seen to greater Advantage. Whatever They are, They contradict not me; nor are They at all pertinent to the Business of the Query. My design was to show, at once, the Doctor's Inconsistency with Scripture, and with Himself: Both which are intimated in the Query. It was your part to defend Him, as fairly as you could. The Doctor, I observed, was obliged from *Gal.* 4. 8. to confess that the Son is *by Nature truly God*. From thence I infer, that His Scheme cannot stand with that Text; being an express Contradiction to it. You insist upon it notwithstanding, that the Son may be *by Nature truly God*, agreeable to the Text, and consistent with the Doctor's Principles. This then is the sole Point between us, to be here discuss'd.

You *have*, you say, *proved, that in Scripture there are* different *and* subordinate *Acceptations of the word*, God. True, you have proved that *Men* have been called *Gods*; and

* Script. Doctr. p. 306, &c.

Idols

Idols Gods; the *Devil* is also a God, (2 *Cor.* 4. 4.) and the *Belly* a God. But, I think, St. *Paul* hath sufficiently intimated, (1 *Cor.* 8. 5, 6.) that the Son is not to be reckon'd among the *Nominal* Gods; besides that you your Selves confess it. If He be God at all, He is a *real* one: And now I want to see what Scripture Warrants, or permits us to profess Two *real* and *true* Gods. You say, the Son is God, *truly*, and *properly*, and by *Nature*, in the *Scripture-Sense* of the word, *God.* (*p.* 110.) Then say I, He must be the same with the one *supreme* God, because there is but *One.* If He is *truly* so, He is the same with the *only true God*; if *properly* so, his Substance is *properly* divine; if *by Nature* so, He has the same *Nature* with the one God. Yet I very well know that you intend nothing like it: Only, from the concurring Language of Scripture and Antiquity, you find it necessary to say as we say: And are afterwards to rack and strain Invention, to find out some subtile and surprizing Meaning for it. What may we not do with any Writings in the World at this Rate, so long as Words are capable of being press'd and tortured into diverse Meanings? But let us go on, to see how you account for the Son's being God *by Nature. If divine Power and Dominion be derived and exercis'd partially, temporarily,* or in *certain Emergencies only, it makes the Persons to be, and to be stiled Gods*; *not by Nature, but by Grace.* Your Notion of *Do-*

minion making *God* to be *God*, has been sufficiently exposed in the former Parts. I need only ask here, what was God before the Creatures were made? Or did He then begin to be *God*, *by Nature*, when He created the Universe, and began to have *Dominion* over it? But to proceed: Give me leave to observe here, that the Son is God, not *by Nature*, but *by Grace*, in Consequence of your own Principles. Being a *Creature*, and *finite*, He can exercise the *divine* Power and Dominion no otherwise than *partially*; and since He did not exercise the divine Power and Dominion to the utmost, before his Resurrection, He exercis'd it only in *certain Emergencies*; and since the *Exercise* began then, and is to end after the Day of Judgment, it is barely *Temporary:* And so, by your own *Characters*, you make Him God, *by Grace*, like *Angels*, *Magistrates*, and *Prophets*; Only his *Dominion* is larger, and for a longer period of Time: This is your God *by Nature*. But you are very excusable for not doing what is ridiculous, at first sight, even so much as to pretend to. For how should the *Son* be God *by Nature*, upon your Principles, when the *Father* Himself, whatever his *Metaphysical Nature* may be (which the * Doctor allows not to come into Consideration) is God by *Office* only; might not have been *God* at all, if He had pleased to make no Creatures; and may cease to be *God*, in the *Scripture-*

* Script. Doctr. p. 243. 296. Reply, p. 301.

Sense

Senſe of the word, whenever He will; by letting all Things drop into their primitive Nothing. Now unleſs *Nature* and *Office* ſignify the ſame, it is not eaſy to conceive, upon the Doctor's Principles, how any Perſon can be *God, by Nature*, at all. You ſay, *if the divine Powers and Dominion be derived to*, and exerciſed by a *Nature, Perſon, or intelligent Subſtance*, UNIVERSALLY (which is impoſſible to ſuppoſe in a finite Creature) PERMANENTLY (which is contrary to your own Suppoſition of a Kingdom which is to have an end) UNALTERABLY, (tho' an *Alteration* is preſumed in reſpect of the Son, and might be ſuppoſed even in reſpect of the Father Himſelf) If theſe Things be ſo; that is, if Contradictions be true, what then? Then *ſuch a Being, or Perſon, is God by Nature*, &c. And this you give us as *the true meaning of Gal.* 4. 8. But, I hope, we ſhall have more reſpect for an inſpired Apoſtle than to Father any ſuch meaning upon Him. For the true Senſe and Import of it, I refer you to the * Learned Gentleman, who has ſo well defended this Text againſt Dr. *Clarke*. You add, *Had not the Scriptures this Senſe of the word, God, They could not be intelligible or reconcilable* (p. 113.) But are you well aſſured that you underſtand whatever is intelligible or reconcilable? *The Metaphyſical Definition*, you ſay, *cannot be the only Scripture-Senſe of the Term*, God.

* True Script. Doctr. continued, *p.* 73, *&c.*

You allow then that it may be the *Principal*, tho' not the *only* Scripture-Senſe; which I am glad to hear from you. The Learned Doctor will not admit the *Metaphyſical* Senſe to be **ever* the *Scripture-Senſe* of the Term, God. The *Metaphyſical* Senſe, He expreſly ſays, is *never intended*; but the *conſtant uſage of Scripture* is different. *The Word, God, in Scripture, is* ALWAYS *a relative Word of Office:* Which tho' the Doctor has no Proof of, or Ground for, yet He knew *why* He ſaid it; and had very good *prudential* Reaſons for it. For, if the *Metaphyſical* Senſe be ever intended, when the word, God, is ſpoken of the Father, no good Reaſon can be aſſign'd why it ſhould not be ſo always, when ſpoken of the ſame Perſon: And if this be the current and moſt uſual Senſe of the word, *God*, in Scripture, we ſhall have a fair handle to prove that it was intended in the ſame Senſe, when ſpoken, in ſuch and ſuch Circumſtances, of the Son: Or, at leaſt, the Doctor will have little or no Pretence left, upon his Principles, for ſaying that the Son is *truly*, and *properly*, God. You obſerve, that the *Metaphyſical* Definition of one *Self-exiſtent, underived, independent, ſupreme* Being would *exclude* the Son, who is *derived*. This is the Sum of your Argument, and clearer than you have put it. But I muſt obſerve to you, that this *Definition*, or ſomething like it, hath long paſſed current with Men who be-

* Script. Doctr. *p.* 296. Reply, *p.* 119. 290.

lieved

lieved a *Trinity* of *divine Perſons*, and were never apprehenſive of any ſuch Conſequence as you would draw from it. It is properly a Definition of the τὸ θεῖον, the divine Nature, *abſtracting* from the Conſideration of the *diſtinction* of Perſons, which is the uſual method that the *Schoolmen*, and others have taken; and there the Words *ſelf-exiſtent*, *underived*, *independent*, are not conſidered as *perſonal* Characters, but *eſſential*. *Neceſſarily-exiſting*, *uncreated*, *immutable*, *all-ſufficient*, are what They mean, in that *Definition:* Otherwiſe it is a Definition of the Perſon of the Father only, ſingly conſider'd. But if inſtead of *Metaphyſicks* (which muſt always be content to ſtand corrected by Goſpel Revelation) we chuſe to take our Definition of God from *Scripture:* Then that of * *Melanction*, which I have put into the Margin, will be more full and compleat.

* Deus eſt Eſſentia Spiritualis, intelligens, verax, bona, pura, juſta, miſericors, liberrima, immenſæ potentiæ, & ſapientiæ, Pater æternus qui Filium Imaginem ſuam ab æterno genuit, & Filius Imago Patris Co-æternâ, & Spiritus Sanctus procedens à Patre & Filio. *Melanct. Loc. Theolog. de Deo.*

QUERY

QUERY XXV.

Whether it be not clear from all the genuine Remains of Antiquity, that the Catholick Church, before the Council of Nice, *and even from the Beginning, did believe the Eternity and Conſubſtantiality of the Son; if either the oldeſt Creeds, as interpreted by thoſe that recite Them; or the Teſtimonies of the earlieſt Writers, or the publick Cenſures paſs'd upon Hereticks, or particular Paſſages of the Antienteſt Fathers, can amount to a proof of a Thing of this Nature?*

YOU tell me, in Anſwer, that it is *not clear that the* Ante-Nicene *Church profeſs'd the Notion of* INDIVIDUAL *Conſubſtantiality:* That *the Objector cannot produce one ſingle Paſſage in all Catholick Ante-Nicene Antiquity, which proves an* INDIVIDUAL or NUMERICAL *Conſubſtantiality, in the three divine Perſons.* This Anſwer is ſcarce becoming the Gravity of a Man, or the Sincerity of a Chriſtian, in ſo ſerious and weighty an Argument. Did I ſpeak of *Individual* Conſubſtantiality; or, if I had, could I mean it in your Senſe? I ask, whether the *Fathers* believed the Three Perſons to be *one Subſtance*; and do affirm that They did, *univerſally.* You Anſwer, that They did not aſſert the Three Perſons

ſons to be *one Perſon*; which is the conſtant Senſe you make of *Individual*. And here, you would make a ſhow as if the *Objector* had been miſtaken, and as if you contradicted Him; when all reſolves into a trifling Equivocation, and you really contradict Him not at all. That *preſent Scholaſtick* Notion, as you call it, of three Perſons being one *Perſon*, *Hypoſtaſis*, or *Suppoſitum*, is no where *preſent*, that I know of, amongſt any that own a *Trinity*; neither is it the *Scholaſtick* Notion; as any Man may ſee, that will but look into the *Schoolmen*, and read with any Judgment. *Individual* has been own'd, but never in your Senſe; and *Numerical* too, but in a Senſe very different from what you pretend to oppoſe it in: And therefore, to be plain with you; this way of proceeding, in an important Controverſy, is neither *fair* towards your Adverſaries, nor *ſincere* towards the Readers; but, at beſt, is only ſolemn Trifling. You know, or you know little in this Controverſy, that all the Fathers almoſt to a Man, either expreſly or implicitely, aſſerted the *Conſubſtantiality* of the Son with the Father. Call it *Individual*, or call it *Specifick*; that is not now the Queſtion. They unanimouſly maintain'd that the Son was not of any *created*, or *mutable* Subſtance, but ſtrictly *Divine*; and ſo cloſely and nearly allied to the Father's Perſon (in a myſterious way above Comprehenſion) that the Subſtance of the Son might be juſtly called

the

the *Father*'s Subſtance, Both being One. And this is all that ever any ſober Catholick meant by *Individual*, or *Numerical*; as I have often obſerved.

Is not this ſufficient to urge againſt Dr. *Clarke* and You, who make the Son of an *inferior* Subſtance, differing entirely in *kind* from the Father's; in ſhort, a *Creature*, tho' you care not to ſpeak it in broad Terms? This is what you have not ſo much as one *Catholick Poſt-Nicene*, or *Ante-Nicene* Writer to countenance you plainly in. The main of your Doctrine, the very Points wherein your Scheme is contain'd, and on which it turns, and which diſtinguiſh you from the preſent Orthodox, ſtand condemn'd by all Antiquity. Do you imagine, all This is to be turn'd off, only by equivocating upon the word, *Numerical*; or by throwing out the Term *Scholaſtick*, to make weak Perſons believe, that we have borrowed our Doctrine from the *School-men* only? No: We know, and you may know, if you pleaſe to examine, that, as to the main of our Doctrine of the Bleſſed Trinity, we have the Univerſal Church, as high as any Records reach, concurring with us. To Them we appeal, as well as to the Scriptures; that, together with Scripture, we may be the more ſecure that we follow the true Interpretation. I need not go on to prove that the primitive Writers aſſerted the *Conſubſtantiality*, becauſe you have not denied it in the Senſe I intended; and indeed could

could not. Your ſlipping a Word upon us, and ſliding off to another Point, may be taken for a Confeſſion and Acknowledgement, that the *Query* was juſt; and ſhould have been anſwer'd in the *Affirmative*, could your Cauſe have ſubſiſted, after ſo large and frank a Confeſſion. *As to Creeds*, you ſay, *none of the Three firſt Centuries expreſs the Queriſt's Notion:* meaning your own Notion of *Individual*, which is not the *Queriſt's*. What follows (*p.* 118.) is ſtill purſuing the ſame miſtake. Since you have told us, that there is no proof of *Individual Conſubſtantiality* (that is, of *perſonal* Identity, as you underſtand it, and in which Senſe no Body oppoſes you) it would have been fair and ingenuous to have own'd that the *Fathers* did unanimouſly hold a *Conſubſtantiality*, in ſome Senſe or other. If not *Numerical*, or *Individual*, in the ſtricteſt Senſe, was it, think you, *Specifick*? Yet, if ſo, it will follow that all the Fathers were directly oppoſite to the Doctor and you; and condemn'd your Notion of the Son's being Inferior in *Kind*, *Nature*, *Subſtance*, &c. *Specifick* Unity implies *Equality* of Nature; as two Men, ſpecifically one with each other, are in *Nature* equal; and ſo, any other two Things of the ſame *ſort* and *kind*. This Notion, if it were all that the Fathers held, You might charge with *Tritheiſm:* And, at the ſame Time, you muſt give Them all up, as no way favourable to your *Hypotheſis*. But the *Fathers* conſtantly took care to ſignify

that

that they did not mean that the *Perſons* were *ſpecifically* one, like three Human Perſons having a *ſeparate* Exiſtence independent of each other: Nor would They allow *Three Suns*, which would be *ſpecifically* one, to be a proper or ſuitable Illuſtration; but the Rays of the ſame Sun, the Streams of the ſame Fountain, and the like; all to intimate a much cloſer Tie, a more *ſubſtantial* Union than *Specifick* amounts to. The *Perſons*, the *Hypoſtaſes*, were Three; and yet *una Subſtantia*, as *Tertullian* expreſſes it, in all.

You would perſwade us (finding I ſuppoſe that either *ſpecifick* or *individual* Conſubſtantiality would be equally againſt you) I ſay, you would perſwade us, that it was ſome *Oratorical* and *Figurative* Conſubſtantiality, which the Fathers meant. This I apprehend from what you drop in Page 121, where you expreſly apply this new Solution to the difficulty ariſing from Ὁμοούσιος in the *Nicene-Creed*. I will not ſuffer the *Engliſh* Reader to go away with this groundleſs Notion, inſtead of a juſt Anſwer. Such as know any thing of Antiquity, do not want to have ſuch Pretences confuted: Such as do not, may pleaſe to take along with Them theſe following Conſiderations.

1. The Doctrine of the *Conſubſtantiality* appears to have been a conſtant ſettled Thing; a ſort of ruled Caſe, running thro' all in general. Strange, that They ſhould all *Rhetoricate* in a Mat-

Matter of Faith, of ſo great Weight and Importance; and that we ſhould not meet with ſo much as one grave ſober Writer, to ſtrip the Matter of all Flouriſh and Varniſh, and to tell us the naked Truth.

2. It is to be obſerved that the Notion does not occur only in popular Harangues, but in dry Debates, chiefly in Controverſy with *Hereticks*; where it concern'd the *Catholicks* to ſpeak accurately and properly, and to deliver their Sentiments very diſtinctly.

3. This is farther confirm'd from the Objections made by *Hereticks* to the *Catholick* Doctrine; There were Two ſtanding Objections made by *Hereticks* to the *Catholick* Doctrine: One was, that it inferr'd a *Diviſion* of the Father's Subſtance: The other that it was *Tritheiſm*. We find footſteps of the former, as early as [a] *Juſtin Martyr*. We meet with it in [b] *Tertullian*, as urged by *Praxeas*. [c] *Tatian* and [d] *Theophilus* Both allude to it. [e] *Sabellius* was full of it; and it was afterwards, one of the chiefeſt Pretences of *Arius*; as may appear from his own Letters, beſides many [f] other Evidences. Now, what colour or pretence could there have been for the Objection, had not the Catholicks profeſs'd a proper Communication of the ſame Subſtance? Need we be

a Dial. p. 183. 373. Jeb. *See* Bull D. F. p. 66, 67. *and* p. 33.
b Contr. Prax. c. 8. c Tat. p. 21. Ed. Worth.
d Theoph. l. 2. p. 129.
e Alexand. apud Theod. E. H. l. 1. c. 4. p. 17. Athanaſ. p. 942.
f *See* Bull D. F. N. p. 33.

told

told that Angels and Archangels, or any created Beings were derived from God without any *Abscission* from, or *Division* of, his *Substance*? Or could it ever enter into any Man's Head to make so weak an Objection to the *Catholick* Doctrine, unless a *proper Consubstantiality* had been taught by Them? Yet this was the principal, the standing pretence for, and support of Heresy for near 200 Years together.

The other was *Tritheism*; objected all along by the *Sabellians*, and afterwards (tho' more sparingly) by the *Arians*. What kind of *Tritheism* the *Sabellians* meant (*Tritheism* in the highest and strictest Sense) appears, not only from the former Objection about the *division* of the Father's Substance, but also, from the way they took to solve the difficulty: Namely, by making Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost one and the same *Hypostasis*, as well as one *Substance*; and their thinking it not beneath the Father Himself to have submitted to *Passion*. This makes it extremely probable that the Church, at that Time, believ'd the three Persons to be *Consubstantial* in a proper, not *Figurative*, Sense; in Consequence whereof, it was pretended that there would be three Gods; in like manner as three Human Persons of the same *specifick* Nature, are three Men.

4. What puts this farther beyond all reasonable doubt, is the method which the *Catholicks* took to answer the Two fore-mention'd Objections. As to That about *Division of Sub-*

Subſtance; They never tell the *Hereticks*, that there was no manner of Ground or Colour for the Objection: They never ſay, that the ſame difficulty would lie againſt God's creating Angels, or Archangels, or any other Creature; as They might, and ſhould have done, had They been of Dr. *Clarke*'s Principles, or of Your's. No: *They only deny any *Diviſion* or *Diminution* of the Father's Subſtance, and illuſtrate, as well as They are able, ſo ſublime a myſtery, by one *Light* kindling, as it were, from *Another*; by the *Sun* and it's *Rays*; by *Fountain* and *Streams*; *Stock* and *Branch*: All Inſtances of the ſame *ſpecifick* Nature, and †anſwering in ſome Circumſtances, tho' defective in others. One would not deſire a fuller and clearer Teſtimony, that thoſe, or the like *Similitudes* were intended to ſignify the ſame with a proper *Conſubſtantiality*, than we meet with in *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria* ‡.

Then, for their Anſwers to the charge of *Tritheiſm*, as underſtood by the *Sabellians*, how eaſy would it have been for Them to have told the Objectors, that They did not take the word *God* in the ſtrict Senſe; that *Moſes* and other mortal Men had been called *Gods*; that They believed the Son to be no

* Juſt. M. Dial. p. 183. 373. Tat. p. 21, 22. Athenag. p. 40. 96. Origen. Pamph. Apol. Tertull. Apol. c. 21. adv. Prax. c. 8. Theognoſt. apud Athanaſ. Vol. 1. p. 230. Hippolyt. Contr. Noet. c. 11. p. 13. Dionyſ. Alexand. Reſp. ad Quæſt. 5.

† *See* Bull. D. F. p. 120.

‡ Apud Athanaſ. de Sentent. Dionyſ. Tom. 1. p. 255, 256.

more than a *Creature*, tho' the moſt perfect of all Creatures; and that the *Sabellians* did Them a very great and manifeſt Injury, to imagine otherwiſe of Them. This would, this muſt have been their Anſwer to the charge of *Tritheiſm* as underſtood by the Objectors; had They not otherwiſe *learned Chriſt*. Inſtead of this, They appear to be very ſenſible of the juſt Weight and Importance of the Objection. They muſt ſecure the *Divinity* of the Son, and yet preſerve the Unity too. They have recourſe to *Unity* of *Subſtance* (even againſt Thoſe who made *one Subſtance* to ſignify one *Hypoſtaſis*) as *Tertullian* frequently does, in his diſpute with *Praxeas:* And notwithſtanding that the *Sabellians* had, if I may ſo ſpeak, carried the Son's *Divinity* too high, in ſomuch as to make Him the very ſame *Hypoſtaſis* with the *Father*; yet the utmoſt that the *Catholicks* could be brought to ſay, in *Degradation* of Him, was only this; that He was *ſubordinate* as a *Son*; equal in every reſpect, but, as a *Son* can be equal to a *Father*; inferior in point of *Original* (the Father being Head and Fountain of all) but ſtill of the ſame Nature, Power, Subſtance, and Perfections; ſubſiſting in, and from the Father, inſeparably and conſtantly, always and every where; and therefore *one God* with Him. And if any Perſon, tho' in the warmth of Diſpute, did but happen to drop any doubtful Expreſſions, tending any way to leſſen the Dignity of the Son, or was

but

but ſuſpected to do ſo; the Alarm was ſoon taken, and it awaken'd the Jealouſy of the *Catholicks*; who could not bear any Appearance of it. This was remarkably ſeen, in the famous Caſe of *Dionyſius*, Biſhop of *Alexandria*, Sixty Years before the riſe of *Arius*, and is recorded by *Athanaſius* in his Works.

5. To this we may add, that while the *Sabellian* Controverſy was on Foot (which was at leaſt 100 Years, and could never have laſted ſo long, had the *Catholicks* been of any other Principles, than Thoſe which I here maintain) I ſay, while this was on Foot, how eaſy would it have been for the *Catholicks* to have pinch'd Them cloſe, and to have preſs'd Them with variety of Arguments, more than They did, had They been of your Principles, or of Dr. *Clarke*'s? The Father is *eternal*, but the Son not ſo; the Father is *omniſcient*, but the Son *Ignorant* of the Day of Judgment; the Father is *omnipotent*, but the Powers of the Son finite and limited; in a word, the Father is *Creator*, but the Son a *Creature*; and therefore They cannot be One and the ſame *Hypoſtaſis*, or *Suppoſitum*. This Argument had been irrefragable, and could not have failed of being urged and preſs'd Home, by Men of ſuch acute Parts, as *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Hippolytus*, and Others, had it been conſiſtent with *Catholick* Principles; or had They not believed, that the Son was *Conſubſtantial*, in the proper Senſe, enjoying all the *eſſential* Perfections of the Father, in common with Him.

6. It would be endleſs almoſt to proceed in this Argument: The reſt I ſhall throw into a narrow Compaſs, and only give Hints for your leiſure Thoughts to inquire into. The ſtrict Senſe which the Antients had of the word *God*, as ſignifying *Subſtance*, and applying it to the Son, in the ſame Senſe; their admitting but one Subſtance to be ſtrictly Divine, and their utter Abhorrence of any inferior Deities; their appropriating Worſhip to the one true God, and worſhiping the Son notwithſtanding; their unanimous Belief of the Son's being *eternal*, *uncreated*, *omnipotent*, and of his being Creator, Preſerver, and Suſtainer of the Univerſe: Any one of theſe, ſingly almoſt, would be ſufficient for the proof of a *proper Conſubſtantiality*, as aſſerted by the *Ante-Nicene* Catholick Writers: But all together, and taken with the other Particulars before mention'd, They make ſo full, ſo clear, ſo ample a Demonſtration of a Matter of Fact, that a Man muſt be of a very peculiar Conſtitution, who, after having well conſidered the Evidences, can make the leaſt doubt or ſcruple of it. And this I hope may be ſufficient in anſwer to your Pretence of an *Oratorical* or *Figurative* Conſubſtantiality; a Pretence, which you lay down with an unuſual Diffidence; and without ſo much as one Reaſon, or Authority, to ſupport it.

It being evident, from what hath been ſaid, that it was a *proper*, not *figurative*, Conſubſtantiality, which the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers inviolably

violably maintain'd; This is all I am concern'd for. As to the Question, whether it shall be called *Specifick*, or *Numerical*, I am in no pain about it. Neither of the Names exactly suits it; nor perhaps any other we can think on. It is such a *Consubstantiality* as preserves the *Unity*, without destroying the *distinct Personality*; such as neither *Sabellians* nor *Arians* would come into, but the *Catholicks* maintain'd, with equal Vigour, against Both. It is a *Medium* to preserve the *Priority* of the *Father*, and withal the *Divinity*, the *essential* Divinity, of *Son* and *Holy-Ghost:* In a word; it is the sober, middle way, between the Extravagancies of Both Extremes.

Query XXVI.

Whether the Doctor did not equivocate or prevaricate strangely, in saying, * The Generality of Writers before the Council of *Nice*, were, in the whole, clearly on his Side: *When it is manifest, They were, in the general, no farther on his Side, than the allowing a* Subordination *amounts to; no farther than our own Church is on his Side, while in the main points of difference, The* Eternity *and* Consubstantiality, *They are clearly against Him? That is, They were on his Side, so far as*

* *Answ. to Dr.* Wells, pag. 28.

we acknowledge Him to be right, but no farther.

IN Defence of the Doctor, you appeal to his very *numerous*, and, as you say, *plain* Quotations from the antient Authors. And this, you promise before-hand, will be made further evident to all *learned* and *unprejudic'd* Persons, as soon as Dr. *Whitby's Observations on Bishop* Bull's Defens. Fid. Nic. *appear in the World.* As to the Doctor's pretended *plain* Quotations, from the antient Authors, They have not *plainly*, nor at all determin'd against the *Co-eternity* and *Consubstantiality* of the Son, the *Points* in *Question*; and therefore can do the Doctor no Service: But, on the contrary, the *Ante-Nicene* Writers, in general, have determin'd *plainly* against Him, as to the main of his Doctrine, wherein He differs from us. In asserting which, I say no more than the great *Athanasius* told the *Arians* long ago, and it is Fact, that all the Writers before Them, of any Repute or Judgment, were directly against Them. " *We give " you Demonstration, says He, that our Do- " ctrine has been handed down to us from Fa- " thers to Fathers. But You, Ye Revivers of " *Judaism* and Disciples of *Caiphas*, what " Writers can you bring to Father your Tenets? " Not a Man can you name, of any repute for " Sense or Judgment. All to a Man are against

* Athanas. de Decret. Syn. Nic. p. 233.

you

you, &c. To the same purpose speaks St. *Austin*, in a studied Discourse, which may be supposed to contain his coolest and most serious Thoughts. " * All the Catholick Interpreters " of the Old or New Testament, that I could " read, who have wrote before me on the " Trinity, which is God, intended to teach, " conformable to Scripture, that Father, Son, " and Holy-Ghost do, by the inseparable " Equality of one and the same Substance, " make up the Unity divine. Here you may observe the Summ of the † *Catholick* Doctrine. The same *Homogeneous Substance*; and *Inseparability*. The first makes each Hypostasis, *res divina*; the last makes all to be *una Substantia*, *una Summa res*, one *undivided*, or *individual*, or *numerical* Substance; one God. This is the Antient *Catholick* Doctrine; and, I think, of the *Schools* too; tho' the *School-men* have perplex'd it with innumerable Subtilties. *Hilary* expresses it briefly thus.

* Omnes, quos legere potui, qui ante me Scripserunt de Trinitate, quæ est Deus, divinorum librorum Veterum & Novorum Catholici Tractatores hoc intenderunt secundum Scripturas docere, quod Pater, & Filius, & Spiritus Sanctus, *Unius ejusdemque Substantiæ* inseparabili æqualitate divinam insinuent Unitatem. *Aug. Trin.* l. 1. c. 3. p. 753.

† *I shall add another Passage of St.* Austin, *to explain his Sense more clearly.*

Trinitas proper *Trinitatem* Personarum, & Unus Deus propter *inseparabilem* Divinitatem, sicut Unus Omnipotens propter *inseparabilem* Omnipotentiam. Ita ut etiam cum de singulis quæritur, unusquisque eorum & Deus Omnipotens esse respondeatur; cum vero de omnibus simul, non Tres Dii, vel Tres Omnipotentes, sed unus Deus Omnipotens: Tanta inest in Tribus inseparabilis Unitas, quæ sic se Voluit prædicari. *August. de Civit. Dei* l. 11. c. 24.

Naturæ indiſſimilis *atque* inſeparabilis *Unitas*. This, I ſay, is the Doctrine; Confute it, if you pleaſe, or if you can: In the mean while however, let us honeſtly own the Fact. But to proceed.

There were many Writings extant in the Times of *Athanaſius* and *Auſtin*, which have not come down to us; and therefore *their* Teſtimonies, in the Caſe, are of the greater force. I might mention other *Catholicks*, about that time, who appealed to Antiquity, with all the Aſſurance and Freedom Imaginable. But the moſt remarkable Inſtance to our purpoſe is, that when in the Time of *Theodoſius*, the *Arians* were preſs'd by the *Catholicks* in diſpute, and fairly challeng'd to refer the matter in Controverſy to the concurring Judgment of the Writers before Them, and to put it upon that Iſſue; the *Arians* declined it, and durſt not abide the Trial. See the Story, at large, in * *Socrates* and † *Sozomen*. So dull were the *Catholicks* at that Time, nay, ſo unthinking were the *Arians* too, that *They* could not perceive, what is now ſo *clear* to the Doctor; that the *generality of Writers*, *before the Council of* Nice, were on the *Arian* ſide: But one Party was confident, and the other ſuſpected, at leaſt, that the *contrary* was true.

But I need not take this *indirect* way of confuting the Doctor's Aſſertion; tho' it affords us a very ſtrong Preſumption, and is of much

* Lib. 5. c. 10. † Lib. 7. c. 12.

greater

greater Weight and Authority than the ſingle Judgment of any of the Moderns: Many of the *Ante-Nicene* Writings, by the good Providence of God, are yet extant, and can ſpeak for Themſelves; Beſides that the incomparable Biſhop *Bull* has unanſwerably defended Them, and vindicated Them from all ſuch Exceptions as appeared to have any Shadow of Truth or Probability in Them. To ſhow you how little Reaſon the Doctor, or your Self, hath to boaſt of the *Ante-Nicene* Writers, as favourable to your Cauſe, I ſhall here ſet down ſeveral Poſitions in which the Doctor and You run manifeſtly counter to the whole Stream of Antiquity.

1. *That the Son is not Conſubſtantial with God the Father.* You are directly oppoſite to all Antiquity in This your leading Poſition, on which the Reſt hang, and on which the Controverſy turns. This is very clear from the Teſtimonies collected by Biſhop *Bull*, and from what additional Obſervations I have made under the laſt Query.

2. *That the Son is not Co-eternal with the Father.* Conſubſtantiality implies *Co-eternity:* Beſides that the afore-mention'd learned Prelate, has given us numerous direct Teſtimonies for it from the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, above Twenty of Them; not one of any Note plainly contradicting Them. Theſe two main Points being determin'd againſt you, the reſt are of leſs moment. Yet I cannot find that the *Antients* agreed

agreed with you in your other inferior Positions, which you bring in as under-props to your Scheme.

3. *That, God, is a relative Word,* Θεὸς *and* Θεότης *signifying not Substance but Dominion, and Authority.* This is directly * contrary to all Catholick Antiquity, a very few Instances excepted.

4. *That God the Father only was God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.* This Position I have shown to be contrary to the Sentiments of the *Ante-Nicene* Writers.

5. *That the Titles of one, only,* &c. *are exclusive of the Son.* This also I have shown, in these Papers, to be directly contrary to the Judgment of the Antients.

6. *That the Son had not distinct worship paid Him till after his Resurrection.* This, in the Sense wherein you understand it, is not true; nor agreeable to the Sentiments of the Antient Church.

* *See* Fiddes, Vol. 1. p. 375, *&c. and what I have observ'd above,* p. 85. *Nothing more common than* Θεότης *for* divine Nature *(as* ἀνθρωπότης *also for the* Human*) in Ecclesiastical Writers. I shall point to a few Instances only out of many.*

Melito apud Cav. Hist. Lit. Vol. 2. p. 33. Grabe Spicileg. Vol. 2. p. 245. Hippolyt. Vol. 1. p. 226. Vol. 2. p. 24. Origen Contr. Cels. p. 342. 404. Cyrill. Hierosol. Catech. 11. p. 142. Cyril. Alex. Thesaur. p. 232. Dial. 1. de Trin. p. 405. Damasc. de Orth. Fid. l. 3. c. 11.

N. B. *There is, in strictness, some difference between* τὸ Θεῖον, *and* Θεότης *(tho' They are often used for each other) such nearly as between* Concrete, *and* Abstract; *but still* Θεότης *refers to* Nature *and* Substance *(as* Θεὸς *also generally does) not* Dominion. Abstract *Names of Substances are not very common indeed, (See* Lock H. V. l. 3. c. 8.*) but here there was a necessity for it.*

7. *That*

7. *That Father and Son (or any two Persons) ought not to be called one God.* I have referr'd to the *Ante-Nicene* Writers, who so called Them, more than once. Some of the Testimonies may be seen at large in Dr. *Fiddes.*

8. *That the Title of God, in Scripture, in an absolute Construction, always signifies the Father.* Directly contrary to the Stream of Antiquity; as may appear, besides other Arguments, from their Application of Scripture Texts, of the Old Testament, in which God is spoken of absolutely, to the Son.

9. *That an Inferior God may be admitted besides the Supreme, and Worship paid to Both.* Nothing can strike more at the very Fundamentals of Religion than this Position, in the Judgment of the Antients in general.

10. *That the Son is not* efficient *Cause of the Universe, and of all created Beings.* This I take to be contrary to all the Antients. See the Testimonies above *.

11. *That the Son Himself is* made *or* created. This neither You nor the Doctor admit *in Terms*; but in *reality*, and *in other words*, you Both do; as hath been shown. This Position is flatly contrary to the Doctrine of the Antients. The Testimonies have been referr'd to above. There are other Particulars, which I may at present forget, or which may less deserve notice. These are enough to show that the Doctor's Pretences to the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, are groundless.

* Qu. 11.

What

What then has the Doctor to plead for Himself, and for his so great Assurance in this Particular? First, That the *Ante-Nicene* (as did also the *Post-Nicene*) Fathers allowed a *Subordination*; which is very true, but not at all pertinent; nor can any Consequence be certainly drawn from it, in favour of the Doctor's *Hypothesis*; which He himself seems to be aware of, as I have remark'd above *. Another Thing is, that the *Ante-Nicene* Writers, some of Them, spoke of a *Temporal* Generation by the *Will* of the Father, which I have accounted for in my former Pages. And a third Thing is, that the generality of the *Antients*, when They speak of God absolutely, ordinarily mean the *Father*, and They distinguish His Person by some eminent Titles, and peculiar Appellations: which may be easily accounted for.

Can these Three Considerations, or if there be more such, be ground sufficient for the Doctor to say, that the generality of the *Ante-Nicene* Writers are *clearly* on his side, when They expressly contradict Him in so many Particulars as I have mention'd; several of Them *essentials* of His *Hypothesis?* The most that in Truth can, or in Justice ought to be said, is, that, in some Particulars, They *seem* to favour Him; but could not *really* mean it; unless They notoriously contradicted Themselves. The very utmost which the most sanguine Man of your side should hope for, is, that the Fathers may be found Contradictory to one another,

* Pag. 300.

ther, or to Themſelves, in order to null their Evidence. If They are conſiſtent, They are our's certainly. And this Difference there is plainly between us, and you: That, as to your Principles, the Fathers are expreſs, clear, and full againſt Them; no poſſibility of reconciling Them together: As to our's, They are no where directly and expreſly againſt us; If They are at all againſt us, it is only *indirectly*, and muſt be made out by *Inference*, *Deduction*, and *remote* Conſequences, neither *clear*, nor *certain*. They may be reconciled to our *Principles*, to *Themſelves*, and to *one Another*: But, as to any conſiſtent Agreement with your's, it is utterly impracticable.

Now, ſuppoſing the Doctor ever ſo ſtrongly to believe that the *Ante-Nicene* Writers, in general, held Principles which neceſſarily infer and imply his Concluſion; yet we inſiſt upon it, that They ought not to be judged of from any obſcure *Conſequences* which the Doctor draws for Them, againſt what They drew for Themſelves. If we once take the Liberty of denominating, ſorting, or ranking of Men with any ſide, not according to what themſelves profeſs'd, but according to what ſome imagine, in Reaſon and good Conſequence, They ought to have profeſs'd, we may call *Proteſtants*, *Papiſts*; *Arminians*. *Calviniſts*; *Orthodox*, *Hereticks*; and what not. There are ſome common Principles which all Mankind agree in; and the ſeveral Differences and Diſtinctions

amongſt

amongſt them ariſe only from their drawing Conſequences differently; and it is this that gives Them their particular and ſpecial Denomination. Now ſince it is evident and viſible, as the Light, that the *Ante-Nicene* Writers did not own the *Conſequences* which the Doctor makes for them, but expreſly and clearly rejected them; conſtantly affirming the *Eternity* and *Conſubſtantiality* of the Son (the very points of Difference between Us and the Doctor) it is plain and obvious to common Senſe, that the Doctor has no juſt claim or title to Them, but that We have: They were, in the main points, *clearly* on our ſide (conſiſtent, or not conſiſtent, is not now the Queſtion) and as *clearly* againſt Him. It is to no purpoſe to plead, in this Caſe, that *Premiſes* only are of any Weight, and that *Concluſions* always ſtand for nothing. This may be allowed in *Argumentation*; but not in determining on what ſide any Perſon, or any Body of Men were in this particular Queſtion; whether ſuch *Concluſions* follow from ſuch *Premiſes*. In this, the *Ante-Nicene* Writers were *directly*, and *plainly*, *Anti-Arian*; and therefore it is a great Abuſe of Language, and as great an Injury to Them and to the Truth, for the Doctor to ſay that They were, *in the whole*, *clearly on his ſide*.

But you had promiſed the World great Matters from a Book of Dr. *Whitby*'s, which has ſince ſeen the Light; and I am therefore obliged to ſay ſomething to it, tho' otherwiſe I ſhould much

much rather wave it; because it is wrote only to *Scholars*, with whom it can do no harm; and because, I believe, you are sensible, before this Time, how uncautious a Thing it is to promise in the Dark; and to be Sponsor for another's Performance, so long before-hand. Dr. *Whitby* is one that has done good Service to the Church, and to the learned World; and one would be willing to throw a Veil over his late misconduct in this Controversy, did not the imprudent Triumphs of others oblige us to take some notice of it. But let us come to the Point: I shall show you, in some short Strictures upon the Performance, how little you are to hope for from it; and how far it comes short of Expectation. I'll divide what I have to say into two Kinds of Observations.

1. Upon general Fallacies, running thro' the whole Book.

2. Upon particular Defects, Misquotations, Misconstructions, Misrepresentations, *&c.*

His principal, and most general Fallacy, is his making *Essence* and *Person* to signify the same. One *individual* or *numerical* Essence, He every where interprets to a *Sabellian* Sense; understanding by it one *individual Hypostasis*, or *real* Person. And this ridiculous Sense He fixes upon * All that now pass for *Orthodox*; and, I think too, upon the generality of Those who have been reputed Catholicks down from the

* Præf. p. 32.

Council

Council of *Nice:* For He [a] charges *Athanaſius* Himſelf with it; who has been generally look'd upon as the Standard of Orthodoxy, in this Article. The Charge is weak, and groundleſs, and more eſpecially in regard to Biſhop *Bull*; who is [b] known to have declared Himſelf againſt it, as frequently, as ſtrongly, and as fully; as it was poſſible for a Man to do. The learned *Examiner*, tho' [c] He ſeems to have known this, is forced to [d] pretend Ignorance, to give the better colour to what He was going about. For, otherwiſe, who would not, at firſt ſight, obſerve the peculiar Extravagance of the undertaking, to confute Biſhop *Bull*, only by ſhowing that the Biſhop has *not* proved what He never intended to prove, nor ſo much as believed, but rejected as heartily as the learned *Examiner* Himſelf can do. However, ſince this was, in a manner, neceſſary, that the learned *Examiner* might *appear* at leaſt to have ſomething to ſay, all due Allowances are to be made for it. Let us now obſerve how in the

a Præf. p 32.

b *I ſhall here only cite one Paſſage of Biſhop* Bull, *ſpeaking of* Sandius; *whoſe ſteps Dr.* Whitby *has too cloſely followed.*

Auctor Ille, ubique in Libro ſuo illud pro certo & rato habet *Homouſianorum*, quos vocat, & *Sabellianorum* de Filio Dei Sententiam prorſus eandem eſſe. Quo nihil a vero remotius eſt; Siquidem ſupra clare oſtendimus, Neminem Dei Filium Patri ὁμοούσιον poſſe dicere, niſi abſurde admodum & improprie, qui cum *Sabellio* ſentiat D. F. N. p. 148.

See alſo D. F. p. 230. Animadv. in Gilb. Clarke, p. 1004.

c *See* Modeſt. Diſquiſit. p. 107. *where He charges Biſhop* Bull *with holding a* Specifick *Unity, and* Præf. p. 31.

d Præf. p. 31.

Entrance

Entrance, He is pleased to state the general Question.

" * Whether *All* the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers " profess'd the very same Doctrine which *We* " *ascribe* to the *Nicene* Council; That is, whe- " ther All acknowledged the same *Numerical* " Essence of the Father to have been *com-* " *municated* to the Son and Holy-Ghost, and " that therefore Both are one God in *Number* " with the Father.

See how many *Guards* He has put in; as it were Conscious of what He had taken in hand, and fearing lest otherwise there should not be left Him strength sufficient to secure a handsome Retreat. He does not say, the *Generality* of the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, but *All*; so that if there happens to be but one Exception, He may still be safe and secure. Next, He does not say the Doctrine of the *Nicene* Council, but which *We ascribe* to that Council: Now, who can tell what *We* He means? Perhaps Himself and Two or Three more. Then again, *same Essence* will not serve, but it must be the same *numerical* Essence: And this He interprets, every where throughout his Book, in a *Sabellian* Sense. So here the *State* of the *Question* is intirely changed: And unless the Bishop has proved (which God forbid) that All

* Utrum Patres Omnes *Ante-Nicani* Eandem Quam *Concilio Nicæno* Tribuimus sententiam amplexi sunt; hoc est, utrum omnes Eandem Numero Patris Essentiam Filio & Spiritui Sancto fuisse Communicatam, eoque nomine utrumque cum Patre *Unum Numero Deum* esse agnoverunt? *Prœm.* p. 2.

the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers were Hereticks and ſomething worſe, profeſſing what Themſelves condemn'd as Hereſy, He has not, it ſeems, done enough to ſatisfy the learned *Examiner*. Not content with this, He demands farther to have it proved that this ſame *numerical* Eſſence, that is (according to Him) *Perſon*, was *communicated* to Two other *Perſons:* And He has ſome pretence for cavil at the word * *Communicated*. Yet, as if all this were not ſufficient, it muſt be alſo by *interior Production*; as He obſerves a little after in pag. 2. and He has ſome Turns of Wit upon the word † *Production*. Was this the way to anſwer ſuch a Writer as Biſhop *Bull*, a wiſe, grave, learned, judicious Author, and One that was above Trifling?

In ſhort, the plain Queſtion between Biſhop *Bull* and the *Arians* is only this: Whether the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, in general, believed the Son to be of an *eternal*, *uncreated*, *immutable*, and ſtrictly *divine* Subſtance, or no? Biſhop *Bull* maintain'd the Affirmative, and has unanſwerably proved it, in the opinion of moſt Men of true Learning and Judgment, whether Here, or Abroad. This is what the learned *Examiner* ſhould neither have concealed, nor diſguis'd; but have frankly and honeſtly confeſs'd, as He did ‡ formerly. If, notwithſtanding,

* Præf. pag. 21. † Præf. p. 23.

‡ Opus aggredior quod Bullus noſtras, Pietate Summa & Doctrina Vir præditus, atque in Antiquitatis totius Scriptis Verſatiſſimus, the

the learned *Prelate* has not proved that the Fathers held a *numerical* Eſſence, in the *Examiner*'s Senſe (ſuch as He thinks neceſſary to preſerve the Unity) the Biſhop ſhould not be repreſented as failing in the Proof of what He intended; but ſhould be given up for a *Tritheiſt*, and the *Catholick* Church with Him, whoſe Advocate He is, and with whom He ſtands or falls. This would have been the fair and ingenuous way; unleſs the learned *Examiner* would have undertaken to prove that the Fathers before the *Nicene* Council were of *Arian* Principles, which He durſt not do. What does it ſignify to ſhow that They were not *Sabellians*? Did Biſhop *Bull*, or does any Man of Senſe pretend They were?

You may judge of the Performance, from his ſtating the Queſtion ſo ſtrangely; and his ſetting out with ſuch diffidence, as if He thought the Cauſe deſperate. When you come to the Book it ſelf, you'l find Two Thirds of it, in effect, little more than retreating to the *Sabellian* Senſe of *Numerical* and *Individual*, which is only ſo much Impertinence. This is the principal, and the moſt general Fallacy which He truſts to; and is, in a manner, the Turn of the whole Book.

He has another *general Fallacy*, which He ſerves Himſelf of ſometimes, and it is this.

opere ære perenniori, ad *Doctorum* Invidiam, & *Novatorum Cordolium*, ſummo judicio & induſtria peregit. *Whitby. Tractat. de vera Chriſt. Deit.* pag. 59.

When He finds ſome Expreſſions run pretty high and ſtrong for the Divinity of Chriſt, * He ſays the *Arians* uſed the ſame, or the like Expreſſions. There is very little Force or Weight in the Argument: For it amounts only to this. The † *Arians*, perfect Maſters of Diſſimulation and notoriouſly accuſtom'd to equivocating, uſed ſuch or ſuch Expreſſions, meaning little by them; therefore the *Ante-Nicene* Writers, Men of a very different Stamp and Character, meant no more by thoſe Expreſſions. But, beſides this, it is well known that the ‡ *Arians*, at firſt, did not uſe thoſe high Expreſſions of the Son, but came into them by Degrees, as They found their Doctrine too ſhocking to be endured in broad Terms; and as They perceived the neceſſity of uſing *Catholick* Language. We can eaſily ſhow, how, and when, and why the *Arians* were obliged to ſpeak higher than They thought. But it can never be ſhown that the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers were under any ſuch Temptation; or that They affected to ſpeak

* Præf. p. 4. 29. Lib. p. 8, 9. 40. 90. 109. 153. 157. *and elſewhere.*

† Scilicet Tenebriones iſti parati erant quamlibet Fidei Confeſſionem ſuo ſuffragio comprobare, quæ modo vocem ὁμοούσιος non haberet: etiamſi quoque in ea ponerentur verba alia quæ apud Sanos omnes idem prorſus ſignificarent. *Bull* D. F. p. 285.

‡ *Arianos* Jeſum Chriſtum *Deum de Deo, lumen de lumine, vitam ex vita, ante omnia Sæcula ex Deo Patre genitum* dixiſſe, Euſebio adhuc in vivis agente, me legiſſe non memini: utcunque poſtea, ad declinandam Invidiam in Publicis Formulis has voces fraudulenter uſurparent, *&c. Cav. Epiſt. Apologet.* p. 65.

Qui Artes Euſebii, reliquorumque *Arianorum* Vocum Ambiguitate perpetuo abutentium, non olfaciet hac in re; ei quid aliud optem non video, præter naſum. *Clerc. Epiſt. Crit.* 2. p. 52.

other-

otherwise than They really meant, or than They would be generally understood. They were plain, open Men; unacquainted with those Principles of Latitude, and studied Refinements which came in afterwards. I may use almost a parallel Instance, from what has been lately seen among our Selves. From the Year 1712. *Arians* have been taught to subscribe the *Nicene* and *Athanasian* Creeds. But our good Fore-fathers would have thought it horrid Prevarication to do it; They were not so subtile and refin'd: And therefore, tho' *Subscription* is now no certain Argument of Men's Sentiments, it was formerly; when Men were otherwise instructed, and loved Christian Plainness and Simplicity. This may serve for a brief *general* Answer to the learned *Examiner*'s second *general* Fallacy.

There is a third *general Salvo*, which occurs pretty often; that the *Ante-Nicene* Writers distinguish God from Christ (that is, the Father from the Son) and call the Father *God* absolutely: Now, since the *Post-Nicene* Writers do so too, and since no Body scruples it, even at this Day; I need not give my self the Trouble of any more particular Answer. Thus far for the general Fallacies, running through his Performance: After which, it may be needless to take notice of any *particular* Mismanagement; But, for a Specimen, you shall have a few Instances of his Misquotations, Misconstructions, Misrepresentations, Reviving of old and

trite Objections concealing the Anſwers, and the like.

To begin with *Miſquotations:* Pag. 22. He cites part of *Polycarp*'s *Doxology*, recorded in the Epiſtle of the Church of *Smyrna*. There He [a] leaves out the Two moſt material words, (σὺν αὐτῷ) on which the Argument chiefly depended, and then inſults over the learned *Prelate*.

Pag. 62. Citing a Paſſage from [b] *Athenagoras*, He changes πρὸς αὐτῆ, into πρὸς αὐτὸν, without giving any notice of it, or reaſon for it; only to make a weak Inſinuation againſt the *Divinity* of God the Son.

Pag. 75, 76. He has a Citation from *Methodius*, part of which you may ſee above (*p.* 143.) the remainder I have here ſet down, in the [c] Margin. After giving a Conſtruction diametrically oppoſite to the Intent and *Letter* of the Author, He breaks out into this Expreſſion; [d] *See how He* (Methodius) *manifeſtly acknowledges the Son to have been made*, and *before begotten* (that is all the Senſe that I can make of what He ſays) *in ſpight of the Biſhop*. He might have ſaid, in ſpight of Grammar and

a *He reads it* δι' ἧς σοι σὺν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ δόξα, *inſtead of* δι' ἧς σοι σὺν αὐτῷ σὺ πνεύματι ἁγίῳ δόξα. Vid. Euſeb. l. 4. c. 15.

b Πρὸς αὐτῆ γὰρ ἡ δι' αὐτοῦ πάντα ἐγένετο. Athenag. Leg. p. 38. Ox. Ed.

c Τὸ δὲ ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε, ὅπ πρὸ ἑωσφόρου ἦδη πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων, λέγει, σὺ τοῖς ἐρωνοῖς, ἐβουλήθην καὶ τῷ κόσμῳ γεννῆσαι, ὁ δὴ ἐστι πρόθεν ἐγνωσμένον γνωρίσαι. Ap. Phot. p. 960.

d En quam clare agnoſcit Filium γεγονέναι & προγεγονέναι factum & prægenitum eſſe, fruſtra præſule renitente. *Modeſt. Diſq.* p. 76.

com-

common Sense: Nothing can be clearer than that Passage of *Methodius* for the eternal Generation of the Son; which He does not only assert, but guards it against the Objection from that Text (*This day have I begotten Thee*) explaining it, not of any *Temporal* Generation (for He allows no such Thing) but of a Temporal *Manifestation*.

Pag. 97. You may see how He deals with a modern Author, the learned Dr. *Cave*. He first applauds his great Knowledge of Ecclesiastical Antiquity (in which He is extremely right) and then cites a Passage from Him, which, as represented, seems to say, that many of the earliest Fathers were against Christ's Divinity. He had done this once before in his * Preface, so that one may see He is pleased with the Discovery. I have given the Passage at large in the † Margin, including that part in Hooks which our learned *Examiner* has left out. The whole turns upon this; whether Dr. *Cave* by, *in quibus*, intended the same as, *in quibus singulis*, in *every one* of the foregoing Particulars, or rather in

* Præf. p. 28.

† Nævos, qui in Scriptis ejus (Lactantii) notantur, *de Divinitate*, de æterna Filii existentia [de Animarum præ-existentia & Futuro post hanc vitam statu, de Fine Sæculi & Mille Annorum Imperio, de Adventu Eliæ Multos ad Dei cultum conversuro] aliisque capitibus, de quibus obscure, incaute, quandoque etiam periculose locutus sit, excusabunt, apud candidos rerum æstimatores, Sæculi quo vixit circa istas res imperitia, dogmata ipsa paulo abstractiora, nec dum a Theologis dilucide explicata nec Synodorum decretis definita, & *in quibus* Ὁμοψήφους habuit complures præcedentium Sæculorum Patres. *Cav. Hist. Liter.* Vol. I. p. 112.

many, or *moſt* of them. It is impoſſible to prove that He meant it ſtrictly of *every* one; and therefore no certain Argument can be drawn from this Paſſage: But I will give you a Reaſon or two, why I think Dr. *Cave* did not, or could not ſo mean it. You'l obſerve, that *de Divinitate*, ſtands by it ſelf, as a diſtinct Article; and, very probably, is to be conſtru'd *of the Deity: Lactantius* is * known to have had very abſurd Notions of the *Deity*, ſuppoſing God to have had a *Beginning*, and to have *made Himſelf*. Dr. *Cave* could never mean that *Lactantius* had Ὁμοψήφους *Complures*, *many of his mind*, in this Article: And therefore could not intend, *in quibus*, ſtrictly, of *every* Particular, but of the whole, and in the general. Then, as to Dr. *Cave*'s Judgment of the Senſe of the *Fathers*, in reſpect to the Divinity of the Son, and his eternal Exiſtence, it is ſo † well known, and ſo often appears in his Writings, that He ſhould not be preſumed to contradict his declared and repeated Sentiments, without a manifeſt neceſſity. Where-

* Lactant. Inſtitut. l. 1. c. 7.

† Sancti Patres Catholicæ Fidei Nicænorumque Dogmatum Teſtes ſunt inconcuſſi, Vindices acerrimi; qui Fidem ab Apoſtolis traditam, a *Majoribus* acceptam, ad nos uſque propagarunt, acceptam Vita, Voce, etiam Sanguine ſuo confirmarunt, invictiſque Argumentis contra omnia Hæreticorum molimina ſartam tectam conſervarunt; quique nullis Sophiſmatibus flecti queunt, ut in *Unitariorum* cauſam Teſtimonium dicant. Hinc illæ Lachrymæ, Hæc Fundi calamitas. Adeo ut de Antiquitate Eccleſiaſtica dici poteſt, quod de *Ratione* alicubi habet Malmsburienſis Philoſophus; ubicunque *Ratio* Homini repugnat, Hominem, ipſi *Rationi* repugnaturum. *Cav. Epiſt. Apologet.* p. 17.

fore

fore Dr. *Whitby* does a great Injury to the Memory of that good Man, by taking an Advantage of an *ambiguous* Expression. To proceed.

Pag. 60. He tells us, that the Titles of ὁ παντὸς ποιητὴς, and τῶν ὅλων δημιουργὸς (that is, *Creator* and *Framer* of the Universe) were such as the Writers of that Age (the Second Century) always distinguish'd the Father from the Son by. If He means that the Son had not then these or the like Titles given Him, it is a notorious Untruth (as you may see by the Quotations * above from *Irenæus* and *Clemens Alexandrinus*) If He means only, that Those and the like Titles were *eminently* and *emphatically* given to the Father, That indeed is very true of the *Second* Century; and as true of all the *Centuries* following, down to this present, as appears by our Creeds; which, I suppose, is no great Discovery.

In his Preface, (P. 32.) He misrepresents *Basil* as declaring against Unity of *Essence*, where the good Father intended nothing but against Unity of *Person*. In the same Page, He brings in † *Athanasius*, and interprets what He said against the ὁμοιούσιον, as if it had been meant of the

* Qu. 9. p. 189.

† Vid. Athanas. Tom. 1. p. 767. *Compare* Tom. 2. p. 31.

Athanasius *distinguish'd very particularly, more than* Hilary *and some other Fathers did, between the* ὁμοούσιον *and the* ὁμοιούσιον. *He thought that to say the Son was only* like *God, was as much as* denying *Him to be* God: *As if we should say a thing is only* like *Silver, therefore not* Silver; *or only* like *Gold, therefore not* Gold. *This was his Sense of the Matter.*

ὁμοού-

ὁμοούσιον, betwixt which, that accurate Father always carefully distinguish'd. A little lower, He represents *Athanasius* as maintaining *numerical* Identity; which (in the Sense of the learned *Examiner*) is making Him a *Sabellian*. Thus, it seems, He is to confute Bishop *Bull*, only by puzzling and confounding such Things, as that incomparable Prelate had made plain and clear.

Pag. 9. He represents *Barnabas*'s Epistle, ἐν νόθοις, which He interprets *Spurious* (*p.* 19.) neglecting and concealing in what Sense * *Eusebius* had reckon'd it ἐν νόθοις; and what had been said by very † learned Men in defence of it.

Pag. 23. He gives a partial Account of the Antient *Doxologies*. No one that has seen St. *Basil*, the eighth Book of the *Clementine Constitutions*, *Polycarp*'s Doxology, and the Church of *Smyrna*'s, besides *Clement* of *Alexandria*'s, and *Hippolytus*'s, can make any reasonable doubt, whether *to* or *with*, were not applied in *Doxologies* to the *Son* or *Holy-Ghost*, as well as *by*, *through*, or *in*, by the earliest *Ante-Nicene* Writers. To pretend *Athanasian* Forgeries in answer to all, is only giving up the point, with the ridiculous Circumstance of appearing to maintain it.

His Account of *Justin Martyr* is one continued Misrepresentation, as may appear in some

* *See* Cave Histor. Literar. Vol. 1. p. 11.

† Pearson Vindic. p. 276. 282. Bull D. F. p. 15. Pr. Trad. p. 3.

Mea-

Measure, by comparing it with what hath been observed in these Papers.

Pag. 61. He takes occasion from the *Latin* Version to misrepresent *Athenagoras*, and to insinuate that the Son is not *like* the Father. If the *Greek* words be render'd, as They signify, *Infecti, & Facti*, the Equivocation upon *Genitus*, and therewith the Argument is lost.

Pag. 62. He undertakes another Passage in *Athenagoras*, a very famous one, and of singular use in this Controversy; plainly showing the true and genuine Sense of such Fathers, as spoke of a Temporal Generation, and being of equal Force both against *Sabellians* and *Arians*, as the * learned Prelate has judiciously and admirably demonstrated against *Petavius*, *Sandius*, and Others. *Sandius*, being sensible of its Weight and Force, thought it the wisest way to say, that the place was corrupt; and being a Man of Wit, He invented something of a Colour for it. *Gilbert Clerke* afterwards, thought of a more plausible Solution of the difficulty; but the learned † Bishop had too much *Acumen* to let it pass. Last of all comes Dr. *Whitby* with a new Device, which, I suppose, is intirely his own. You see the Passage in the ‡ Margin. The words ὡς γενόμενον, He construes thus: *Not as eternally generated*, as if

* Bull. Def. F. N. p. 204, 205.

† *See* Bull. Animadv. in Gilb. Cl. Op. Post. p. 1052. 1053.

‡ Πρῶτον γέννημα εἶναι τῷ πατρὶ, οὐχ ὡς γενόμενον, ἐξ ἀρχῆς γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς νοῦς ἀϊδίου ὢν, εἶχεν αὐτὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸν λόγον ἀϊδίως λογικὸς ὤν. Athen. Leg. c. 10. p. 38.

He

He had read γενόμενον, ſupplying ἀϊδίως by Imagination. The Senſe and Meaning of the word * γενόμενον, ſignifying *made*, or *created*, is ſo fix'd and certain in this Author, that no doubt or ſcruple can be reaſonably made of it. And that He intended to ſignify the Son's *immutable, eternal, neceſſary* Exiſtence, in this Paſſage, is ſo manifeſt, that a Man muſt be of a peculiar Complexion that can ſo much as queſtion it; eſpecially conſidering the other high Things ſaid of the Son, by this Author, in other Places; ſome of which have been above cited. I mention not how the learned *Examiner* endeavors to elude Them; putting off one with a jeſt (*p.* 60.) pretending an *Interpolation* for another (*p.* 61.) and for fear all ſhould not ſuffice, retreating at length to his Quibble upon the word, *Numerical*.

Pag. 108. He makes a ridiculous Repreſentation of *Tertullian*, as if that Writer believed two *Angels* to be as much *One*, as God the Father and God the Son are. I ſhall only † tranſcribe the Paſſage, and truſt it with the intelligent Reader.

* Ἕνα Θεὸν ἄγει τὸν τῶδε ⸗ πάντος ποιητὴν, αὐτὸν μὲν ἀ γενόμενον, ἀπ τὸ ὂν ἀ γίνεται, ἀλλὰ τὸ μὴ ὄν —— p. 21. Τὸ ὂν ἀεὶ, γένεσίν τε οὐκ ἔχον ἢ τι τὸ γενόμενον μὲν οὐ δὲ οὐδέποτε. p. 67. Οὐ φύσι ὄντων ἀλλὰ γενομένων. p. 68.

† Et nos etiam Sermoni atque Rationi, itemque Virtuti, per quæ omnia molitum Deum ediximus, propriam Subſtantiam *Spiritum* inſcribimus; cui & *Sermo* inſit prænuntianti, & *Ratio* adſit diſponenti, & *Virtus* perficienti. Hunc ex Deo prolatum didicimus, & prolatione generatum, & idcirco Filium Dei & Deum dictum, ex *Unitate Subſtantiæ*. Nam & *Deus Spiritus*.——Ita de

Pag.

Pag. 110. 113. You find Him tampering with *Irenæus*, First, insinuating as if that excellent [a] Writer had supposed the *Son was our Lord and God, according to the good Pleasure of the invisible Father*; but admitting the more probable Construction to be, that every *knee might bow*, according to the *good Pleasure* of the invisible Father.

It is well known that *Irenæus* [b] allows no *Creature*, nothing that had a Beginning, to be justly called *God*; [c] looks upon the Notion of an *inferior God*, as a Contradiction; does not [d] admit that any *Creature* can *create:* And yet He makes the Son [e] truly God, [f] *Co-eternal*, and [g] *Consubstantial* (tho' He uses not the very word) with God the Father; Creator of Men, of Angels, of all Things. Testimonies of the last particular are so many and so clear (some of which have been cited above) that I need not here refer to them. In Contradiction to all this, Dr, *Whitby* would perswade us (from two of three Passages which say no such thing) that *Irenæus* resolved all the Dignity of the Son into the Powers given Him after his Resurrection. I may, upon this Occasion, take notice of another [h] Writer, who has lately

Spiritu Spiritus & de Deo *Deus*, ut *Lumen* de *Lumine* accensum. *Tertull. Apol.* c. 21. p. 202. Ed. Havercamp. Lugd.

a Irenæus, l. 1. c. 10. p. 48. Ed. Bened.

b Irenæus, lib. 3. c. 8. p. 183. Ed. Bened. c Lib. 4. c. 2. p. 229.

d Lib. 4. c. 41. p. 288. e Lib. 3. c. 6. p. 180. Lib. 4. c. 6. p. 235. f Lib. 2. c. 13. p. 132. Lib. 2. c. 25. p. 153.

g Lib. 3. c. 21. p. 217. Lib. 2. c. 25. p. 153.

h Emlyn. *Exam of Dr.* Bennet, p. 18. *first Edit.*

misre-

misrepresented *Irenæus*. He imagines that the good Father supposed the Λόγος, or Word, as such, *passible*. The Passages, which He builds this Fiction upon, you have in the * Margin, according to the last Edition. The most that you can espy in them is, that the Λόγος *suffered* in the Flesh: One of the Quotations does not *certainly* say so much, but might bear another Construction. It might as reasonably be pretended that the Λόγος, as such, was *Visible*, and *Comprehensible*, and changed into a *frail Man*, as that He was *passible:* See the Margin. All that *Irenæus* intended to prove against the *Hereticks*, was, that the Λόγος was constantly united to the Man Christ Jesus, and did not desert the *Human Nature* in the *Passion*, it being † necessary that the suffering Redeemer should be both God and Man: This is all the Case. But to proceed with the learned *Examiner*.

Pag. 147. He represents *Tertullian*, as making

* Solus vere Magister Dominus noster; & bonus vere Filius Dei, & patiens, verbum Dei Patris Filius Hominis factus. *Iren.* l. 3. c. 18. p. 211.

Ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ σὰρξ ἐγένετο, καὶ ἔπαθεν. l. 1. c. 10. p. 50.

Compare the following Places.

Verbum, Unigenitus qui semper humano generi adest, & consparsus suo Plasmati, secundum placitum Patris & Caro factus, Ipse est Jesus Christus Dominus noster, qui passus est, p. 206.

Ὃς καὶ σὰρξ τῇ αὐτῇ σαρκὶ, σὺν ᾗ ἐπαθεν ἐλεύσεται. p. 207.

Invisibilis visibilis factus, & incomprehensibilis factus comprehensibilis, & impassibilis passibilis, & Verbum Homo. p. 206.

† *See* Irenæus, l. 3. c. 18. p. 211. *See also the famous Passage about* Quiescence, p. 213. *Which plainly supposes all that was suffering and low to belong to the* Man *only, all that was high and great to the* Λόγος, *or Divine Nature.*

the

the Son, in his highest Capacity, *Ignorant of the Day of Judgment*. Let the Reader see the * whole Passage, and compare it with another, four Chapters lower; and from thence judge of *Tertullian*'s meaning. No reasonable doubt can be made, but that *Tertullian* understood the Son's being *Ignorant*, &c. in respect only of his *Humanity*, as well as He understood the other Things, mention'd together with it in the same Paragraph. Such as consider how highly *Tertullian*, elsewhere speaks of the Son, making Him one *undivided* Substance with the Father, can make no question of it.

Here it will be proper to obviate a difficulty which may naturally, upon the first Thoughts, arise in one's Mind. Why should the *Catholicks* so often urge the Texts relating to Christ's *Human* Nature only, against the *Sabellians*? For it may seem that, if They thereby proved Two *Hypostases*, They proved only a *Divine* and a *Human Hypostasis*; and there might still be but one *Hypostasis* in the *Godhead*, as the *Sabellians* pretended? But it is to be consider'd, that Both *Catholicks* and *Sabellians* were agreed

* Ignorans & Ipse Diem & Horam Ultimam, Soli Patri notam; disponens Regnum Discipulis, quomodo & sibi dispositum dicit a Patre; habens Potestatem Legiones Angelorum postulandi ad auxilium a Patre si vellet, *Exclamans quod se Deus reliquisset*, in Patris manibus Spiritum ponens. *Tertull. Adv. Prax.* c. 26. p. 516.

Habes ipsum *Exclamantem* in Passione, *Deus Meus, Deus Meus*, ut quid me dereliquisti? —— Sed Hæc Vox Carnis & Animæ, id est, Hominis, non *Sermonis*, nec *Spiritus*, id est, non *Dei*, propterea emissa est, ut impassibilem Deum offenderet, qui sic Filium dereliquit, dum Hominem ejus tradidit in mortem. *Tertull. adv. Prax.* c. 30. p. 518.

in

in one Point, that God was incarnate, the *divine* Nature perſonally united to the *Man Chriſt Jeſus:* And the main Queſtion between Them was, whether the *Father* Himſelf made one Perſon with Chriſt's Human Nature, or No. If the *Catholicks* could prove the *Negative* (as They could eaſily do) then the *Sabellians* muſt, of Courſe, and upon their own Principles, acknowledge another *divine Hypoſtaſis*, beſides the Father. The *Catholicks* therefore urged all the Texts, wherever Chriſt ſpeaks of Himſelf as a *diſtinct* Perſon from the Father; tho' many of theſe Texts are meant of Him, in his *Human* Capacity only. Had our Saviour *Chriſt* ſpoke of the Λόγος, or *Word*, in the ſame manner as He does of the Father: Had He prayed to the Λόγος, or *Word*, complain'd of being *forſaken* by Him; or had He ſaid, I know not the Day of Judgment, but He, the Λόγος, or *Word*, does; it could never have been preſumed, that the *I* and HE, the Λόγος and *Chriſt*, made one *Perſon*. It appearing therefore, from that manner of Expreſſion, that the *Father* was not *perſonally* united with the Human Nature of Chriſt; this was ſufficient againſt the *Sabellians*, who allowed that the Man Chriſt Jeſus was perſonally united with *God:* And if it could not be with the *Father*, it muſt of Conſequence be with another *divine Hypoſtaſis*, a *diſtinct* and *real* Son of the Father. Thus you ſee the Force and Significancy of thoſe Texts (and of all Texts which intimated a plain

a plain *personal* Distinction between the *Father* and *Christ*) against the *Sabellians*. They showed that the Person speaking was not the *Father*. And yet the Person who spake, having (as both Sides allowed) a *Divine* and *Human* Nature, might speak of Himself in different Respects; in this, or in that Capacity. Thus, in regard to the Son's *Ignorance of the Day of Judgment*, it is manifest that the *Father* and *Son* are there spoken of, as of Two Persons; and One as *knowing*, the Other as *not knowing*, tho' only in a certain respect: One *Ignorant* in such a Capacity, the Other not Ignorant in any Capacity at all, as having never taken *Human Nature*, and therewith *Human Ignorance*, into a *personal* Union with Himself. Thus far to clear this Point, and to acquit my self of a * promise made you some time ago.

I shall proceed a little farther in remarking on your Friend's Performance. It is frequent with Him to bring up old Objections, neglecting and concealing the Bishop's Answers. I shall give a few Instances only; that I may not be Tedious.

Pag. 17. He pretends that the Bishop has not shown, that the Fathers of the *Second Century* resolved the Unity into the same Principle with the *Nicene* Fathers. Yet the Bishop † has

* Qu. 7. p. 111. *See* Athanasius *farther upon the Thing whereof I have been speaking.* Vol. 1. p. 261.

† Bull. D. F. Sect. 4. c. 4.

ſhown it, and Dr. *Whitby* allows as much in the very next Page; and has nothing to retreat to but the miſerable Evaſion about *Individual*.

Pag. 84. He refers to *Baſil*, as an Evidence that *Gregory Thaumaturgus* believed the Son to be a *Creature*. This He again repeats in the next Page; and again in his Preface, *p.* 10. Yet the Fact is evidently falſe; *Baſil* Himſelf a full Witneſs on the contrary ſide; and this Biſhop *Bull* had [a] given notice of, and made clear to a Demonſtration. When a Writer ſtrains ſo hard, to put a *falſe* Senſe upon Another; there's no uncharitableneſs in believing, that He gives us at leaſt his *own true* meaning.

Pag. 87. He revives an old Objection, which the learned Prelate had ingenuouſly [b] ſet forth in its full Force; and given it as full an Anſwer. Your Friend is here pleaſed to ſpeak with great contempt of the Biſhop's Anſwer; for no other reaſon, that I can ſee, but becauſe He was not able to confute it. Being however reſolved to ſay ſomething, He ſtoutly denies a plain Matter of Fact. Οἰκονομία, ſays He, is never uſed by the Fathers, in the Biſhop's Senſe. Pleaſe to turn to the places noted in the [c] Margin, and judge whether the Biſhop, or He, be the

a Bull. Def F. N. p. 155, 156, 157.

b Bull. D. F. p. 267.

c Tertullian adv. Prax. c. 2, 3. Clem. Alexandr. p. 831. 955. Tatian c. 8. Ed. Ox. Hippolytus Contr. Noet. p. 12. 15.

Valeſius *had obſerved the Thing long ago, and without any View to Controverſy.*

Vetus omnis Chriſtianorum Theologia Deo quidem Patri Mo-

more

more faithful and accurate in this Matter. If any thing farther be wanting in Defence of Bishop *Bull*, in this Article, let Him speak for Himself, in another [d] Work, in answer to *Gilbert Clerke*; who, it seems, was much offended at the οἰκονομία, grieved, as He well might, to see His most pompous and plausible Pretences entirely baffled by it. I should weary my Reader, and my Self too, if I went on remarking every Place, where old Objections are brought up; and either none, or very slight notice taken of the Answers: If you have a mind to compare, you may note some Pages referr'd to in * the Margin. I shall proceed no farther, in this tedious and disagreeable Employ-

narchiam attribuit, Filio vero & Spiritui Sancto οἰκονομίαν, id est, Administrationem & Dispensationem. *Vales. Not. ad Euseb.* p. 5, 6. *See also* p. 90. 253.

d Bull. Posth. Works, p. 1045, 1046, 1047, *&c.*

* Modest. Disquisit. —— Bull's Def. F.

Pag. 27.	Pag. 258. 120. 70.
29.	66.
30.	165.
40.	69. Judic.
50.	217.
62.	205.
69.	119.
74.	161, 162, 163.
77.	165—80. 111. 136.
82.	118.
95.	168. 202. 264.
96.	169.
107.	206.
109.	41.
120.	77.
122.	77, 78.
141.	261.
169.	293.

ment; except it be to obſerve to you, one peculiar piece of Management, which I leave you to reflect on. The learned *Examiner* labours, for * two Pages together, to ſhow that *Clemens* of *Rome* was far from ſpeaking, or thinking ſo highly of our Bleſſed Lord, as St. *Paul* did. A little after, (Pag. 19.) He propoſes *Clemens* to us as a very good Interpreter of Scripture; and commends Him highly, for laying Chriſtianity before Us in its naked Simplicity. What can we think of this? The beſt Conſtruction I can make of it is, that He intended in p. 14, 15, not St. *Paul* Himſelf, but St. *Paul* as now generally underſtood: And ſo He was to inſinuate ſomething, which was not fit to be expreſs'd. But a Man of Art would have conducted better; would not have diſcover'd Himſelf ſo ſoon, but have truſted more to the Sagacity of his Reader. This manner of proceeding, in an important Cauſe, is what I cannot account for. It ſeems to me, that, if there be not Reaſons of Conſcience obliging a *good* Man to ſpeak out, there are always Reaſons of Prudence which ſhould make a *wiſe* Man hold his Tongue.

You may perceive, by this Time, that Biſhop *Bull*'s Book is like to ſtand, till ſomething much more conſiderable appears againſt it.

* P. 14, 15. Aliter plane D *Paulus* loquitur: ——— Argumento potius eſt *Clementem* de Chriſto aliter plane quam *Paulum* ſenſiſſe ——— magnam ſuſpicionem injicit, eadem *Clementem* cum *Paulo* minime docuiſſe.

Several

Several attempts of this kind have been made before; but to as little purpoſe: And if there be ever ſo many more, by ever ſo good Hands, I'll venture to ſay, They will ſucceed no better. The Book will ſtand as long as clear Senſe, ſound Reaſoning, and true Learning have any Friends left. The main Subſtance of it is not to be confuted; any more than you can extinguiſh Truth, or put out the Light of the Sun. The *Fathers* have been tried and are found *faithful:* What They defended while living, The *Divinity* of our Bleſſed Lord, againſt the Inſults of *Jews*, *Pagans*, and *Hereticks*, They ſtill maintain in their Works: And their Works will be held in great Eſteem, and Veneration; while every weak attempt to blaſt their Credit, will meet with what it juſtly deſerves; I was going to ſay what, but it may ſound ſevere: I proceed to another Query.

QUERY XXVII.

Whether the learned Doctor may not reasonably be supposed to say, the Fathers are on his side, *with the same meaning and reserve as He pretends our* Church-Forms *to favour Him; that is, provided He may interpret as He pleases, and make them speak his Sense, however Contradictory to their own: And whether the true Reason why He does not care to admit the Testimonies of the Fathers as* Proofs, *may not be, because* They are against Him?

IN Answer to this, You tell me, that it contains only an *invidious* Suggestion; not any *Argument*. The Suggestion, I do assure you, is just, and *argumentative* too; and was *kindly* intended towards you; that you might not take Things implicitely and upon Trust from others, but might examine them first your Self; and then pass a Judgment of them. As to the *invidious* Appearance of it; had I ever intended, or in the least thought of making the *Queries* publick, you might, with a better Grace, have told me of it. But as I had not the liberty of revising my Papers, nor so much as any previous Apprehension of your Design (presuming all along the very contrary, as I reasonably might) these Things considered, I hope the *invidious* Part you'l take to your self; the *Argument*

gument (for an *Argument* it is, in its kind) you may leave to me. It is of some moment to us, not only to have the *primitive* Writers on our side (as we plainly have) but to have them *thought* so too. The learned Doctor has made some Pretences that way; and they are of Weight with such Readers, as are not duly apprehensive of the Doctor's uncommon manner of setting Things off, with great advantage to his Cause, and as great detriment to Truth. Two Reasons are intimated, in the Query, why his claim to *Antiquity* ought to have the less Force with considering Men: First, Because He lays claim to our Church's *Forms*; which every common Reader may see, are directly against Him; And Secondly, Because, notwithstanding his appeal to *Antiquity*, He is wiser than to put the Matter upon that Issue. He endeavors to lessen the Esteem of the Antients, all the while that He presumes They are on his side: A sure Mark that He suspects Them; and is securing a Retreat when They fail Him; as they certainly will, whenever strictly inquired into. I would leave it with any discerning Man (who cannot examine farther into the Merits of the Cause) to judge, whether it be at all likely that those who speak always contemptibly of the Antients, and endeavor to the utmost to abuse and expose Them, can reasonably be presumed to have a greater Interest in Them, than They who speak honourably and handsomly of Them; who defend their Chara-

cter, and have, as it were, an affectionate Tenderneſs and Concern for Them. Thus much for the ſecond Reaſon intimated in the *Query*. As to the firſt Reaſon ſuggeſted, the Import of it is this. If the learned Doctor can eſpy *Arianiſm* in our Liturgy or Articles, where it certainly is not; He may as reaſonably be ſuppoſed to miſtake as much, among the *Fathers*. He ſees, in our Liturgy, the Doctrine of one God the Father, *incluſive* of Son and Holy Ghoſt; but does not ſee one God *excluſive* of Both; which is his Doctrine. He finds a *Subordination* of *Order* taught in our publick Forms; but does not find any Subordination or Inferiority of *Nature*; which is his Principle. And yet, upon theſe ſlight Grounds, He ſcruples not to ſay, that the * *main Branches* of his own Doctrine are *expreſly affirm'd* in our Liturgy; meaning, by a tacite *Conſequence* of his own making. And ſince this *Conſequential*, that is, *Imaginary* Countenance is all that He can claim from our *Liturgy*; and all that He really means, when He ſays the Church's Forms are on his ſide; poſſibly He may mean no more, when He ſpeaks of the *Fathers*. The generality of Readers, it may be, underſtand Him, as if He had intended to ſay, that the *Ante-Nicene* Writers eſpecially, had declared againſt the *Co-eternity* and *Conſubſtantiality* of the Son, the Points in Queſtion. But I humbly conceive, He in-

* Script. Doctr. p. 379.

tended

tended no more than this, that the *Ante-Nicene* Writers have declared ſomething, which, He really believes, does by *Conſequence* deſtroy the *Conſubſtantiality*, &c. though, at the ſame time, thoſe Writers admitted no ſuch *Conſequence*; but *expreſly*, and *conſtantly* diſowned it. This is all that He *can mean*, with reſpect to our *Liturgy*; and therefore, probably, all He *does mean*, in reſpect of the other; or however, certain I am, that it is all He *ſhould mean*. Now you ſee the full of my Argument. If it look *invidious*, I cannot help it; I am perſwaded it is juſt; and I think it of as much Importance to our Readers to have the Matter fairly ſtated, as it is that Truth may not be ſmother'd; nor any ſtreſs laid upon the Doctor's Citations, beyond what They do really bear. The learned Doctor owns, as to *Poſt-Nicene* Fathers, that They are, in the whole, againſt Him. And He ſhould have own'd as much of the generality, at leaſt, of the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers too, and then He has no claim to any thing but *Conceſſions*; of which He endeavors to make the utmoſt Advantage, *three* ways. Firſt, by making more *Conceſſions* than there really are: Secondly, by repreſenting thoſe *Conceſſions* in ſo promiſcuous and confuſed a Light, that a common Reader cannot readily diſtinguiſh when, or where the Doctor intended the full and intire meaning of an Author, or a *Conceſſion* only: Thirdly, by ſlipping his own Concluſion upon thoſe *Conceſſions*, as if

They

They were the same Thing; tho' there really is no Connexion between Them, no just Consequence from one to the other. I would not be knowingly guilty of charging the Doctor falsely, in these, or in any other Particulars, for any Consideration; and therefore it may be expected of me, that I explain my self more at large; which accordingly I shall do, in the Order and Method which I have already laid down.

1. The learned Doctor has taken several Passages for *Concessions*, which are really none; but only as He has given Them such a particular Air and Aspect; either by *prefacing* Them, and holding out a false Light to the Reader; or by *commenting* upon Them; or by *ill-translating* of Them. I shall proceed to Particulars; and you must not take it amiss, if we call upon you to return us back what you have unfairly wrested from us.

Scripture-Doctrine, Pag. 3. The Doctor produces a Passage of *Athanasius*, part of which, so far as concerns us, you see in the * Margin; with so much farther as is necessary to clear the Sense of the Author. The Doctor's Version runs thus: "For He (*the Father*) is the one "God, and the only One, and the First. And

* Εἷς γὰρ Θεὸς ὁ μόνῳ τῷ πρώτῳ ἐστιν· ὅτι εἰς ἀναίρεσιν δὲ τῆς λέγεται· μὴ γένοιτο. ἐπὶ γὰρ ὁ αὐτὸς ὢν τῷ ἑνὶ, τῷ πρώτῳ, τῷ μόνῳ, ὡς τὸ Ἑνὸς ὁ Μονὸς ὁ Πρώτου τῷ μόνῳ λόγῳ, τῷ σοφίᾳ, τῷ ἀπαυγάσματι ᾧ. ἔτι δὲ καὶ πρῶτος τῷ αὐτὸς, πλήρωμα τῆς τοῦ πρώτου καὶ μόνου θεότητος, ὅλῳ τῷ πλήρης ὢν Θεός. Athanas. 3. Orat. Contr. Arian. p. 556. Ed. Bened.

"yet

" yet *these Things do not destroy the Divi-*
" *nity of the Son.* This rendring is flat and low, and neither answers the *intent*, nor *Letter* of the Author. Οὐκ εἰς ἀναίρεσιν, literally, is, *not to exclude the Son:* plainly meaning, not to exclude Him from being the *one God*, and the *only One*, and the *First*, together with the Father. And so *Athanasius* interprets Himself, in the Words immediately following: For He (*the Son*) also is πρῶτος, the *First*, the fullness of the Godhead of Him who is the *First*, and *only* God. You'l observe that the Doctor renders ἀπαύγασμα, as if it had been ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης, *Brightness of Glory:* Which is again concealing and stifling the Sense of the Author. *Athanasius* intended to signify the Son's *issuing* or *streaming* forth, as it were, from the Father's Substance, as Light from the Sun; which meaning is lost and sunk in the Doctor's Translation. You see then that this Passage, when rightly understood, is intirely against the Doctor; and therefore ought not to be reckon'd amongst *Concessions.*

Let us go on to another, in the very same Page (the Passage you have in the * Margin.) The Doctor renders it thus: " The true God, " who is *most* strictly and absolutely such, even " the Father of Christ. Here the *English* Reader must needs think that, if the Father be *most* strictly, He is *more* strictly God than

* Τὸν ἀληθινὸν καὶ ὄντως ὄντα Θεὸν, τὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ πατέρα. Athan. Contr. Gent. p. 9.

Christ

Chriſt is: Eſpecially when nothing appears in the Paſſage to compare the Father with, but Chriſt. Under this view, indeed, the Paſſage cited is a very great *Conceſſion:* But, in the *Greek*, there is no *Conceſſion* at all. The juſt and *literal* rendring of the Paſſage is this: *The true God who in reality is ſuch, namely, the Father of Chriſt.* You muſt know, that *Athanaſius* is here exhorting the *Gentiles* to turn from their dumb Idols, to ſerve the living God. In oppoſition to what He calls * ἐκ ὄντα, *Things* which have no *real* or but *precarious* Exiſtence, or † ἐκ ὄντα τοιαῦτα, *Things* which were not *ſuch as the Heathens imagined*, i. e. not *divine*, He adviſes Them to come over to the *Father of Chriſt*; whoſe property it is to *exiſt* in *reality*, and who is *truly* and *ſtrictly* God. This is no more than *Athanaſius* would have ſaid of the *Son*; and ‡ indeed has ſaid, in that very Treatiſe; and therefore you may pleaſe to ſtrike this Paſſage alſo out of the Number of *Conceſſions.*

The learned Doctor goes on, in the ſame way (pag. 4.) And in another Paſſage, inſtead of *far above all created Being* (which the *Greek* Words ſignify, and which is the *certain* meaning of the Author) He chuſes to ſay *far above all derivative Being*; inſinuating to his Reader as if the Son were to be included under *derivative Being*; than which nothing

* Vid. Athanaſ. ibid. p. 7, 8. † Athanaſ. p. 27.

‡ Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς, ὢν ἐστι, καὶ ἐ σύνθετος. διὸ καὶ ὁ τότε λόγος ὢν ἐστι, καὶ ἐ σύνθετος, ἀλλ' ἴδιος ᾧ μονογενὴς Θεὸς ——— ὡς ἀγαθὸς τῷ ἑαυτοῦ λόγῳ, καὶ αὐτῷ ὄντι Θεῷ, τὴν σύμπασαν διακυβερνᾷ ᾧ καθίστησιν. Athan. Contr. Gent. p. 40.

can

can be farther from the Sense of the Author, in that very Page; as I have observed * before, on another occasion. All the *Concession* that is there, lies only in the Doctor's *Translation*, and the Turn He gives to it in the Sequel: *Athanasius* himself has granted nothing that can do you any Service; at least, not in that Passage, and therefore let that also return to us again.

Pag. 89. The Doctor cites a Passage of *Eusebius*; which, He says, *expresses the unanimous Sense of the Catholick Church:* And it may be true, as it lies in *Eusebius*. But, as it is represented in the Doctor's Translation, excluding the Son from any proper *Efficiency* in the Work of Creation, it is diametrically opposite to the *unanimous Sense* of the Antients, and to *Eusebius* too; as hath been shown above †.

Pag. 100, 101. The learned Doctor has two Citations from *Chrysostom* and *Basil*; who interpret the Text, of *Power*, as the Doctor also does of *Power*. But if the Doctor means one thing by *Power*, and They another, and the *Ideas* be intirely different; their Interpretation and his must be as different as the *Ideas* are: And it is not fair to quote them as agreeing in the *Thing*, when They agree only in the *Name*. I have ‡ before took notice how the Doctor dealt with *Chrysostom*, in order to conceal the good Father's true meaning. I shall here ob-

* Qu. 11. p. 291. † Qu. 11. p. 183. ‡ Qu. 23. p. 368.

serve,

ſerve, how He perverts *Baſil*'s Senſe, by a ſmall and ſeemingly ſlight Turn in his Tranſlation. * *Baſil*'s Words are ἴσα καὶ ταυτοῦ κατὰ δύναμιν. That is, *Equal, and the very ſame, in reſpect of Power.* The Doctor drops *equal*, which would have diſcovered *Baſil*'s meaning; and renders it, *One and the ſame in Power.* And thus *Baſil*'s Words, which are utterly repugnant to the Doctor's *Hypotheſis*, are improved into a *Conceſſion* in favor of it.

Pag. 102. He gives us a low and lame Conſtruction of a noble Paſſage in † *Irenæus.* The Words, κατὰ τὸ θεϊκὸν καὶ ἔνδοξον, He renders, *in a divine and glorious Manner:* The true rendring is, *in his divine and glorious Character:* Namely, that which He had as God, and Son of God. *Irenæus*, in that Chapter, is repreſenting the Son as acting at different Times, in a different Character or Capacity. When He appeared to the *Patriarchs*, then He acted in his higheſt Capacity, in his *divine* Character. What that *Character* is, ‡ *Irenæus* explains,

* Σαφῶς τὸ ἓν, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἴσα καὶ ταυτὰ κατὰ δύναμιν παραλαμβάνων. Baſil. Contr. Eun. l. 1. p. 35.

† Καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῖς μὲν πρὸ Μωϋσέως πατριάρχαις, κατὰ τὸ θεϊκὸν καὶ ἔνδοξον ὡμίλει· τοῖς δὲ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ, ἱερατικὴν ..... τάξιν ἀπένειμεν, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα Ἀνθρωπος γεγόνει, &c. Iren. l. 3. c. 11. p. 191.

‡ Ὁ δὲ ἀπαύστου πηγὴς λόγος, ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῶν χερουβὶμ, καὶ συνέχων τὰ πάντα. Iren. p. 190.

Ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡγεμονικὴν αὐτοῦ ..... καὶ ἔνδοξον γενεάν.

Illam quæ eſt a Patre, principalem, & efficabilem, & glorioſam generationem ejus enarrat, dicens ſic, *In principio erat Verbum, & Verbum erat apud Deum, & Deus erat Verbum,* Et *omnia per ipſum facta ſunt, & ſine ipſo factum eſt nihil.* Iren. p. 191.

a lit-

a little above, in the same Chapter: It is, as He is the *Word*, the *Framer* (or Maker) *of all Things, who sitteth upon the Cherubims, and containeth all Things*, who is the Son of God, and God. This shows what is meant by the τὸ θεῖκὸν καὶ ἔνδοξον, and, at the same time, shows that, according to *Irenæus*, the Λόγος who is *God*, then acted in his own proper Character, and not in the *Person* of the *Father* only; which the Doctor would infer from this Passage.

Pag. 115. He cites a place of *Justin Martyr*, where He renders the Words, which you see in the * Margin, thus. "It was not God the "Creator of the Universe, which then said to "*Moses*, that He was the God of *Abraham*, "and the God of *Isaac*, and the God of *Jacob*. An uncautious Reader might imagine from this Passage, put into this View, that the Son is not *God* absolutely, nor *Creator* of the Universe, according to *Justin*. But the meaning is, that That divine Person, who called *Himself* God, and was God, was not the Person of the *Father* (whose *ordinary* Character is that of *Maker of all Things*) but another divine Person, *viz.* God the Son. The unlearned Reader should be told, that what is here said by *Justin*, was in dispute with a *Jew*, who would not acknowledge more *divine* Per-

* Οὐχ ὁ ποιητὴς τῶ ὅλων ἔφη Θεὸς ὁ τῷ Μωσεῖ εἰπὼν αὐτὸν εἶναι Θεὸν Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ Θεὸν Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ Θεὸν Ἰακώβ. Justin. Mart. Dial. 180. Jebb.

sons

ſons than One. It was *Juſtin*'s Buſineſs to ſhow, that there was a *divine* Perſon, one who was God of *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*, and was not the *Father*; and therefore there were two *divine* Perſons. The learned Doctor, upon his Principles, could not, in that way, have confuted the *Jew*; ſo far as I apprehend of *Juſtin*'s Argument: For the *Jew* might reply that it was an Angel ſpeaking *in the Perſon of God*; and that therefore the *Father* only was *God* notwithſtanding. But *Juſtin* inſiſts upon it, that there was another Perſon, beſides the Father, who was really *God of Abraham*, &c. If this is to be taken for a *Conceſſion*, it may be eaſily ſeen on what Side it is.

Pag. 116. The Doctor does not do Juſtice to *Hilary*. Inſtead of *called* Lord and God, which is *diminutive*, it ſhould have been, *declared to be* Lord and God: But this may appear ſlight. Such another ſlight inaccuracy appears in his affecting to tranſlate *God his Father*, inſtead of *God the Father* (p. 104. 179.) which however ſhows too much leaning to a Cauſe; and helps to convey a falſe Idea to the *Engliſh* Readers.

Pag. 251. He has a long Citation from *Novatian*; in which all proceeds ſo fair and plauſible, that a Reader, already poſſeſs'd with the Doctor's Scheme, and carrying it in his Head, may think that every Thing falls in naturally with it. But, at length, the Doctor comes to

* ſome

* ſome croſs Words, and ſuch as, if ſuffered to appear, would have made the Reader conſtrue all backwards, and have given quite another Light to all that goes before or after. Here He ſtops ſhort; breaks off in the middle of a Sentence, paſſes over the offenſive Words, draws a Line, skips to the next Sentence, and goes gravely on to amuſe his Reader. A Writer is not to be blamed, in ſome Caſes, for taking what is to his purpoſe, and omitting the reſt: But, as the Caſe is here, the beſt and, indeed, only Light to direct the Reader to the true meaning of what is cited, is left out. The word *Divinity*, for inſtance (which occurrs twice in that Paſſage) an *Engliſh* Reader will be apt to take in the Doctor's Senſe; and indeed can hardly do otherwiſe: But had the whole appeared, He could not but ſee how much the Doctor is miſtaken. I muſt obſerve to you, that (*p.* 336, 337.) the Doctor deals with *Novatian*, and this very Paſſage, almoſt in the ſame manner, again: Excepting that growing a little bolder, He takes more freedom in his Tranſlation. Mind the Words in (*p.* 337.) By the Son in † *acknowledgment* return'd; and compare, *per Subſtantiæ*

* Unus Deus oſtenditur Verus & Æternus Pater, á quo Solo Hæc vis Divinitatis emiſſa, *etiam in Filium tradita & directa rurſum per Subſtantiæ Communionem ad Patrem revolvitur.* Deus quidem oſtenditur Filius cui Divinitas tradita & porrecta conſpicitur, & tamen nihilominus unus Deus Pater probatur. *Novat.* c. 31.

† The Latin is, *reciproco meatu* illa majeſtas atque divinitas ad Patrem qui dederat eam rurſum ab illo ipſo Filio miſſa revertitur & retorquetur. *Ibid.* c. 31.

Communionem, a little before. *Novatian*, in this place, had no thought of *Acknowledgments*, nor any thing like it: But was intent upon quite another Thing; explaining and illuſtrating, as well as He was able, the Union and Communion of *Subſtance* in Father and Son; and ſhowing how all recurs to one Head and Fountain: On which account the Father might be reaſonably ſtiled the one God, in as much as the Son is ſo intimately one with Him, as to be reckon'd, in a manner, to Him, and not another God from Him. It is all but one *Divinity*, or *divine Subſtance*, of the Father in Both.

Pag. 254. We may obſerve another Turn, by way of Tranſlation. The * *Greek* you may ſee in the Margin, which the Doctor renders thus: "That Jeſus Chriſt, our Lord and God incar-"nate, is not the Father, nor, as the *Sabel-*"*lians* would have it (that ſame Perſon who "is ſtiled) the only God; This the Holy Scri-"ptures every where Teſtify. The literal and plain Tranſlation is thus: *That Jeſus Chriſt, our Lord and God incarnate, is not the Father, nor* (*in the* Sabellian *Senſe*) *the only God, the Holy Scriptures every where Teſtify.* This meaning, you ſee, is clear, plain, and eaſy, without the Doctor's Embaraſments; and is undoubtedly the true Senſe of the Author. But ſuch a hint as this might have made an unlucky

* Ὅτι ὁ σαρκωθεὶς Κύριος καὶ Θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ Πατὴρ οὐκ ἔστιν, οὐδ', ὡς ἐκεῖνοι φασὶν, ὁ μόνος Θεὸς, ἅπασα μαρτυροῦται αἱ θεῖαι γραφαί. Athan. Contr. Sabell. p. 47.

diſco-

discovery to the Reader; Namely, that a Man may believe the Son to be the *only God*, without being a *Sabellian*.

In the same Page, The Doctor has another Quotation from *Athanasius* (if that Treatise be his) which, had He gone on but a few Words farther, would have appeared Contradictory to to the purpose, for which it was brought. " * There is but one God, because one Father; " but the Son also is God, having a sameness " with the Father, as a Son; not that He is " the Father Himself; but in Nature united with " the Father; two indeed in Number, but one " intire Essence. This is the whole Sentence literally tranflated; and the Sense of it is clear. The cutting it into halves, only to represent one part under another View, is not giving the Sense of a Writer, but *making* one for Him.

P. 255. The Doctor cites another Passage from *Athanasius*; and by the Turn He gives it, stifles the true Sense of the Author. " † The " word has no other sort of Divinity, but that " which He derives from the only God, as " being begotten of Him.

* Εἷς Θεὸς, ὅτι καὶ πατὴρ εἷς· Θεὸς δὲ καὶ υἱὸς, ταυτότητα ἔχων, ὡς υἱὸς πρὸς πατέρα· οὐκ αὐτὸς ὢν ὁ πατὴρ, ἀλλ' ἡνωμένος πρὸς τὸν πατέρα τῇ φύσει· δύο μὲν ἀριθμῷ, μία δὲ οὖσα οὐσία τελεία. Athan. Contr. Sabell. p. 41.

† Μίαν ἀρχὴν οἴδαμεν, τόν τε δημιουργὸν λόγον φάσκομεν οὐχ ἕτερόν τινα τρόπον ἔχειν θεότητος, ἢ τὸν τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ, διὰ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ πεφυκέναι. Athan. Contr Arian. Orat. 3. p. 564. Ed. Bened.

The true Construction is This:

" The Word has no other kind of Divinity, " but that of the only God; because He is be- " gotten of Him. The plain meaning is, that the *Godhead* of Father and Son is all one: Directly contrary to what the Doctor cites the Passage for. After I had wrote this, I found that the Doctor Himself (*p.* 317.) had translated the Sentence in the very same Words that I have done; excepting his putting *derived* (instead of *begotten*) which might convey a low Idea to his Reader. But, not content with that, for fear a sagacious Reader should chance to discover the true Sense of the Author, He inserts a Note upon, *Divinity*; interpreting it (*divine Power*) in Contradiction to the Author's known ordinary Sense of θεότης, as well as to the Context.

Pag. 256. He cites * *Gregory Nazianzen*, and translates Him thus: " There is but one " God; the Son and the H. Ghost being referr'd " to the one Cause. But then He adds a Note, which confounds all: *Namely*, says He, *as being divine Persons by whom the one God, or one Cause and Original of all Things, made and governs the World.* Right; if We are to teach the Fathers how to speak: But what said *Gregory Nazianzen*? It is this: " We may, " as I conceive, preserve (*the Doctrine of*) one

* Τηροῖτο δ' ἂν, ὡς ὁ ἐμὸς λόγος, εἷς μὲν Θεὸς, εἰς ἓν αἴτιον καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ πνεύματος ἀναφερομένων· οὐ συντιθεμένων, οὐδὲ συναλειφομένων· καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἓν καὶ ταυτὸ τῆς θεότητος, ἵνα οὕτως ὀνομάσω, κίνημά τε καὶ βούλημα, καὶ τὴν τῆς οὐσίας ταυτότητα. Greg. Naz. Orat. 29. p. 490. Ed. Paris.

" God,

" God, by referring both the Son and H. Ghoſt " to one Cauſe, without Compoſition, or Con- " fuſion; and by aſſerting (as I may ſay) one " and the ſame Movement, and Will of the " Godhead, together with Sameneſs of Eſſence. Here is not a Syllable about the one God's governing the World by his Son and his Spirit; which, tho' a true Notion, is not ſufficient to account for the *Unity*; nor is it *Gregory*'s Account of it, as the Reader muſt have imagined from the Doctor's Comment.

Pag. 323. The learned Doctor by wrong Pointing, and Miſtranſlating, perverts a Paſſage of *Juſtin Martyr*. But I have explain'd and vindicated the true Senſe of it * elſewhere.

Pag. 325. He produces an excellent Paſſage of *Irenæus*, and tranſlates it juſtly. But fearing it might ſound too high, He ſubjoins a leſſening Note, to draw off the Reader's Thoughts. " This Paſſage (ſays He) is parallel to Thoſe " wherein He calls the Son and Spirit the " Hands of the Father, namely, *executing his* " *Will as perfectly*, as a Man's own Hands " perform the Will of the Man. But why may it not be rather *parallel* to thoſe Paſſages wherein the Author ſays, the *Son* and *Holy Spirit* are (in a qualified Senſe) the very *Self* of the Father? They are here called his *own Off-ſpring, and his own Figure*, and *all the Angels* are ſaid to *ſerve and do obeyſance* to Them. Does not this ſound ſomething higher

* Qu. 8. p. 131.

than *executing* the Father's *Will*, however *perfectly*? Or, than the low *Metaphor* about a *Man*, and his *Hands*, as the Doctor represents it? True, *Irenæus*, and many other of the *Fathers*, use that Expression, which They took from Scripture; but They understood a great deal more by it; The same as by * δύναμις, or *virtus*, the *mighty Power* of God, and God Himself.

In the same Page, He cites another excellent Passage of † *Irenæus*; and I am glad to have this Opportunity of setting before the Reader, in its true Light, so illustrious a Testimony of a *Co-eternal* and *Co-essential* Trinity. The *literal* Translation of the *Greek* may run thus: "Man being *created* and *fashion'd*, is *made* "after the Image and Likeness of the *uncreat-* "*ed* God: The Father *designing* and giving "out Orders; the Son executing and creating; "the Holy Ghost supplying Nutriment and "Increase. Here you'l observe, that the joint Operations of the three divine Persons, concurring in the Creation of Man, are set forth in such a Manner, as to intimate both the distinct Personality, and Unity of Essence. That *Irenæus* supposed the three Persons to be the one ἀγέννητος Θεὸς, or *eternal God*, here spoken

* Vid. Tertull. Contr. Hermog. c. 45. Euseb. in Psalm. p. 701, 722. Athanas. p. 214. 880. Ed. Bened. Hieron. Tom. 4. p. 49. Ed. Bened.

† Ὁ γεννητὸς καὶ πεπλασμένος Ἄνθρωπος κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν τοῦ ἀγεννήτου γίνεται Θεοῦ· τοῦ μὲν πατρὸς εὐδοκοῦντος καὶ κελευοντος, τοῦ δὲ Υἱοῦ πράσσοντος καὶ δημιουργοῦντος, τοῦ δὲ πνεύματος τρέφοντος καὶ αὔξοντος. Iren. lib. 4. c. 38. p. 285.

of,

of, may appear; 1. From his introducing the three Persons immediately after, as Explanatory of it. 2. From [a] his understanding *Gen.* 26. 1. of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, *Let* Us *make*, and also, *after* Our *Image*, so that the Image of any one is the Image of all. 3. From *Irenæus*'s other known Principles; his asserting the Son to be *infectus*, or ἀγέννητος; (*uncreated*) and supposing the Son and Holy Ghost, to be the [b] *Self* of the Father; and speaking of Father and Son together, as *one* God. 4. From several Hints, in the same Chapter, all confirming this Sense. One Character of the ἀγέννητος, there given, is τέλειος: The same Character is, in the same Chapter, [c] applied to the Son, in the same Sense. All Things, but the ἀγέννητος, are said to be *in* [d] *Subjection:* among which Things, *Irenæus* can never be supposed to include the Son and Holy Spirit. And farther, every thing that is not, ἀγέννητος, comes short of Perfection, according to [e] *Irenæus*; who, at the same time, asserts the Perfection of the Son, as before said. These Things consider'd, the meaning of *Irenæus*, in this Passage, appears to be, that the

a Manus Dei ad quas pater loquens, dicit, Faciamus *Hominem ad Imaginem & Similitudinem* Nostram. Iren. l. 5. c. 1. p. 293.

Idem ipse qui ab initio plasmavit Adam, cum quo & loquebatur Pater: Faciamus *Hominem secundum Imaginem & Similitudinem* Nostram. l. 5. c. 15. p. 312.

b Lib. 2. c. 30. p. 163.

c Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τέλειος ὤν. p. 284.

d Τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάντα ἐν ὑποταγῇ μένει τοῦ Θεοῦ p. 285.

e Καθὸ δὲ μή ἐστιν ἀγέννητα, κατὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὑστερεῖν τοῦ τελείου. p. 283.

three divine Persons are one eternal, or *uncreated* God, as also one *Creator*. How then came the Doctor to cite such a Passage, which threatens nothing but Ruine and Destruction to his Principles? The Case is this: The learned Doctor, by a strange over-sight, read ὁ μὲν Θεὸς, instead of ὁ μὲν Πατὴρ, tho' Both the *Greek* and the old *Latin* agree in this last Reading. This Alteration, in the *Text*, spoils all the Elegance, and alters the whole Turn of the Sentence: Besides this, the Doctor translates ἀγεννήτῳ, *unbegotten*, instead of *unmade*; not observing the *Antithesis*, between γενητὸς Ἄνθρωπος, and ἀγεννήτῳ Θεῷ, nor attending to, *Infecti Dei*, in the old Translation; which might have set Him right. Thus far I have gone on with some of the Doctor's Quotations; but give me leave to step back for a few more, which I have overlook'd.

P. 308. The learned Doctor produces a Passage of * *Basil*, which He renders thus; very surprizingly. "We affirm that according to "the natural Order of *Causes* and *Effects*, the "Father must have the pre eminence before "the Son. Whoever heard before, from any *Catholick*, that the Son was an *Effect* of the Father? Could *Basil* say this? If the Doctor would but have suffer'd the very next immediate Words, which make part of the Sentence, to

* Ἡμεῖς δὲ, κατὰ μὲν τὴν τῶν αἰτίων πρὸς τὰ ἐξ αὐτῶν σχέσιν, προϋπάρχειν φαμὲν τὸν πατέρα· κατὰ δὲ τὴν τῆς φύσεως διαφορὰν, ἅμα, οὐδὲ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ χρόνου ὑστέρησιν. Basil Contr. Eun. l. 1. p. 31.

appear,

appear, They would have undeceived his Reader. The literal Conſtruction of the whole Sentence is this: "We do indeed allow, that, in reſpect "of the natural Order of (*Emanative*) Cauſes "and Things iſſuing from them, the Father is "*Prior* in *Order* to the Son: But as to any "Difference in *Nature*, or *Priority* of Time, "we allow no ſuch Thing. *Baſil* had juſt before * explain'd what He meant by the Father's being *Prior* in order of *Cauſality*, by the Inſtance of *Fire*, and *Light* ſtreaming from it.

Pag. 317. The Doctor has another Citation from † *Baſil*, which He renders thus: "Therefore our Lord ſaith, *all mine are thine*, as "referring to the Father, the original Cauſe of "all Things: And *thine are mine*; as ſignifying that from the Father was derived to "Him the Power of producing Things. The true Rendring is thus, very near the *Letter*. "Therefore our Lord ſaith, *all mine are* "*thine*, in as much as the Original of the "*Creatures* is referr'd up to the Father: And "*thine are mine*, in as much as the Power of "*Creating* deſcends from Him, to the Son. That is, with his *Eſſence*, as *Baſil* explains

* Ἐπὶ τ τάξεως εἴδες, ὅτι ὁμ τ παρ ἡμῶν θέσεως συνιστάμενον, ἀλλ' αὐτῇ τῇ κατὰ φύσιν ἀκολεθίᾳ συμβαῖνον, ὡς τῷ πυρὶ πρὸς τὸ φῶς ἐπὶ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ. Ibid. p. 30.

† Διὰ τῦτό φησιν ὁ κύριος, πὰ ἐμὰ πάντα σά ἐστιν, ὡς ἐπ' αὐτὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τ δημιεργημάτων ἀναφερομένης, τὰ πὰ σὰ ἐμά, ὡς ἐκεῖθεν αὐτοῦ τ αἰτίας τοῦ δημιεργεῖν καθηκόσης. Basil. de Sp. Sanct. c. 8. p. 161. *It ſeems from what follows, that* αὐτά, *rather than* αὐτῦ, *is the Reading.*

it

it a little after. The Doctor, I presume, did not care that his Reader should know, how clearly *Basil* distinguishes the Son from the (Δημιουργήματα) *Creatures*; and not only so, but supposes the *Creatures* of the *Father* to be *Creatures* of the *Son* likewise. I may just take notice, how particularly fond the learned Doctor is of the Phrase, *was produced* (*See* p. 275. 277. 281. 291) which He uses frequently, without any warrant from the *Authors* He translates; and for no other reason, that I can see, but because it is apt to convey a low Idea (the *Idea* of a *Creature*, tho' the Doctor does not like the *name*) to the *English* Reader.

I shall proceed no farther in this Article, having given Instances enough to show that some Abatements and Allowances should be made us, for such *Concessions*, as are really no Concessions in the Authors Themselves. Upon the whole, one might really wonder that the learned Doctor, who had so wide a Field of Antiquity to range in, and was only to pick out such Passages, as running in general Terms, or taken separately, might be made to appear under such a View as He intended, should produce no more; but be forc'd even to wrest and torture several of those He had found, by prefacing, commenting, and translating, to accommodate Them at length hardly, and after great Reluctance, to his Purpose. You will say, perhaps, that the Doctor sets light by the Fathers, and lays no stress upon Them; I shall

I shall believe you, when He fairly gives them up. At present, it must be thought that They are esteem'd of some Moment, when a Book is stuffed with Quotations out of Them, and so much pains taken to make Them any way serviceable. One that sets so great a value upon the meer *appearance* and *shadow* of Antiquity, can hardly be supposed to slight the Thing it self: If the learned Doctor is so well contented with *Concessions* only, snatch'd, in a manner, and extorted from the *Antients*; how would He have rejoyced to have found Them come heartily, readily, and throughly into his Scheme, as They do into Ours?

II. But supposing all the Doctor's Quotations from the *Post-Nicene*, or *Ante-Nicene* Writers had been at least real and full *Concessions*; yet there is something so peculiar in this new way of quoting *Concessions*, without taking notice of what should come in to explain, or ballance Them, that we have reason to except against it, as not a fair way of dealing.

1. Because, though the learned Doctor does give notice in his Preface, that we are not to take the Opinion of the Authors, in the whole, from those Quotations; yet many may happen to read the Book without considering, or remembring a short hint in the Preface; and so may lay a greater stress upon those Authorities than the Doctor intended.

2. Because the Doctor no where (in *Scripture-Doctrine*) gives any Marks of Distinction for an ordinary

ordinary Reader to underſtand, where He intended a *Conceſſion* only of an Author, and where his intire Opinion; where He agreed with the Doctor in *part* only, and where in the *whole*. Inſtead of this, He rarely lets his *Engliſh* Reader ſee more of any Paſſage, than may appear to comport with, and favour his own *Hypotheſis*; either ſtriking out what might have diſcover'd it to be a *Conceſſion* in part, or diſguiſing it in his Tranſlation, or explaining it away, by his prefacing it, or commenting upon it. Beſides, ſince Authors have very ſeldom, if ever, been cited in this manner (by Men of Character) in favour of ſuch Principles as They really diſown'd and rejected in the main; Readers will be apt to carry that Preſumption and Prejudice along with Them; and a ſhort Advertiſement in the Preface, will not be ſufficient to prevent it.

3. Another reaſon againſt this Method is, that it gives a Handle to many to boaſt of the numerous Collections of Dr. *Clarke* againſt the *Received* Doctrine. See (beſides others) *the Diſſwaſive from inquiring into the Doctrine of the Trinity* (p. 28.) where this very uſe is made of it. By this means, Truth is darken'd, Evidences perplex'd, and the common Readers rather puzzled and confounded, than let into the true State of the Fact; ſo far as relates to the Judgment of the *Antients*.

4. It ſhould be conſider'd that the *moral* Obliquity and *Turpitude* of miſquoting or miſ-

repreſenting

representing Authors, consists in this: That it is a means to deceive the Simple, to surprize the Unwary and Unlearned (who must, or will receive Things upon Trust) it is taking Advantage of the blind Side of Human Nature, laying a Snare for such Readers (perhaps Ninety-nine in a Hundred) as read not with due Care and Thought. I do not see but this very Method of the Doctor's (tho' He has endeavor'd to lessen the Scandal of it) is big with all this Mischief. He has indeed given notice; and wise Men and Scholars would have been secure enough *without* it: Others will not be so, *with* it: And therefore He is still to take Advantage of the Ignorance of one, the Partiality of another, the Forgetfulness of a third, the Credulity, Simplicity, Hast, and Inadvertency of as many as come unprepared and unfurnish'd to the reading his Citations. The Thing it self, you may perceive, is equally mischievous, however gilded over with specious Pretences. And there's no more in it than this: *Misrepresentation practis'd*, and at the same time, seemingly *defended*, and (tho' the learned Doctor does not perceive it) it is really nothing else but contriving a way how to reconcile (if possible) a *good Name*, and an *ill Thing* together.

5. It might be of ill Example, should this method of citing Authors (never before used by good and great Men) grow into Vogue. A *Romanist*, for instance, might, in this way, undertake to defend some of the *Romish* Tenets.

In

It would be eaſy for Him to make a numerous Collection of Teſtimonies from the *Fathers*; and as much to the purpoſe, as the Doctor's Collection is. Two Inconveniencies He might foreſee; one to his own *Character*, upon diſcovery; the other to his *Cauſe*, becauſe His own Citations might be turn'd againſt Him. To obviate the former, He might declare beforehand, that "He did not cite places out of theſe "Authors ſo much to ſhow what was the Opi-"nion of the Writers themſelves, as to ſhow "how naturally Truth ſometimes prevails by "its own native Clearneſs: And to obviate the latter, He might ſay, He alledged the *Teſtimonies* not as *Proofs*, but as *Illuſtrations* only. Thus the Writer might ſeem to come off pretty handſomly: But, in the mean while, the unlearned and unthinking might be led aſide by the fair ſhow of Authorities; and all the Remedy left for them is, *Si Populus vult decipi, decipiatur*. Theſe are my preſent Sentiments of the Nature and Tendency of this new and extraordinary Method of Citing; which, however, I ſhall be very glad to alter, if I ſee any good Reaſon for it. To me it ſeems that it ought never to be practis'd, tho' to ſerve the beſt Cauſe in the World.

III. After all, I muſt obſerve to you, ſuppoſing the Method to have been ever ſo fair, and the *Conceſſions* both many and real, the Doctor has ſtill failed in his main point, of making out the *Importance* of thoſe *Conceſſions*, to the Cauſe in Hand.

Hand. There the Stress should have been laid: We did not want to know what *Concessions* the Fathers, in general, had made; being ready at any Time to make the same *Concessions*: But show us the *Connexion* between these *Concessions*, and the Doctor's *Conclusion*. This is the Point which should have been laboured; and which required all the Learning and Acuteness which the Doctor is Master of. As thus: The Fathers asserted the *first Person* only to be *unbegotten*, or *unoriginate*; therefore They must of Consequence make the Son no more than an *inferior God*, or no God. The Fathers supposed the Son *subordinate*, as a Son; therefore They must by necessary Consequence, deny his *Consubstantiality* and *Co-eternity*. This was the *Conclusion* which the Doctor was to draw out of those Premises; and show to be just and true. But, instead of this, He drops the principal Thing; repeats indeed the *Concessions*, such as They are, over and over; and, by a multitude of Words (not to show any *certain Connexion*, but only a *verbal Resemblance*) He at length slips his *Conclusion* into their Places. There is really nothing more, in this Management, than interpreting *Ill* what the good Fathers meant *Well*; giving a *low* Sense to Words and Phrases which They intended in a *high* one; and putting an *Arian* Construction upon *Catholick* Expressions. This is all that the learned Doctor hath really done by the help of those *Concessions*. In the same way, a Man may quote all the

the *Conceſſions* of the *Fathers* about a *proper Sacrifice*, in favor of the *Sacrifice of the Maſs*: Or their *Conceſſions* about a *real Preſence*, in favor of a *ſubſtantial Preſence* of Chriſt's Body and Blood in the *Euchariſt*. Only, if He would do it artfully and plauſibly, He ſhould take care to reſt in *generals*; and ſupply what is farther wanting, by *Intimations*, and *Innuendos*. This ſeems to have been the very Method which the learned Doctor has taken to grace, and ſet off many of his *Propoſitions*; the 9. 11, 12. 17. 34, 35, 36. 39. 43, *&c.* The *Conceſſions* there cited come not up to the points in diſpute betwixt Us, being moſtly ſuch *general* Things as may be admitted on either Side; and ſuch as would not have been ſuſpected to favor the Doctor's Cauſe, in *Oppoſition* to Us, but by appearing in the Doctor's Book. To make them ſuit the better, the Doctor has form'd his *Propoſitions*, for the moſt part, in *general*, or *ambiguous* Terms; content to ſcatter Intimations of his Meaning here, and there, as He ſaw proper; and to truſt the reſt to the Sagacity, ſhould I ſay, or Weakneſs of his Readers. And now, what is the reſult of this Method of Citing, or what does it really prove? I will tell you frankly and plainly. Firſt, It proves that general Expreſſions are capable of being put into different Views, and may be made to look this way, or that (taken ſeparately) by Men of Wit. Secondly, It proves that when pertinent Authorities cannot be had,

Writers

Writers in a Cause will be content with Any. This is All. Having seen what the learned Doctor's Evidence from Antiquity amounts to; I shall next attend to what You have to say in defence of Him.

You persist in it, that *the Ante-Nicene Fathers and Councils — agree with the Doctor in every Interpretation of Scripture, wherein He disagrees with the School-Notions.* By *School Notions* (a Term of Art) I am to understand the *Catholick* prevailing Notions of the Blessed Trinity. And will you pretend to say, that the *Ante-Nicene* Writers agree with the Doctor in every Text? How strangely you deceive your self? Do the *Ante-Nicene* Writers interpret the first of St. *John*, so as to make the Father *one God supreme*; the Word *another God*, an inferior God besides Him. This is the Doctor's real and intended Interpretation of it; and your's too, however carefully you disguise it. Did the *Ante-Nicene* Writers interpret the Doctor's 300 Texts, or any one of Them, so as to exclude the Son from being *one God* with the *Father*? No certainly: They declare the contrary, and proclaim Father and Son to be *one God.* Is it possible that the *Ante-Nicene* Writers (who understood all the Texts to be consistent with the Son's *Consubstantiality* and *Co-eternity* which the Doctor cites in Opposition to Both) should interpret the Texts as He does? It is too great an Affront to common Sense, to pretend it. But the

way is this: When the Doctor produces the Texts, He expreſſes but part of his Sentiments; and in ſuch general Words, as *Catholicks* and *Arians* may Both agree in: And ſo far He and his Authorities go on together. Afterwards He comes out of *generals*, bringing the Words down to a particular reſerved meaning, before concealed (and which the *Antients* would have rejected with Abhorrence) and ſtill He appeals to the *Antients*, as agreeing with Him in his *Interpretations*. Thus, for Inſtance; in interpreting the Texts which ſpeak of the *Father* as the one God, He finds ſome of the Antients ſay, the Father is Αὐτόθεος, the Son *Second* only, or *Subordinate*, God of God. Very well: So *ſays* the Doctor too: And now, who can make any doubt whether the Antients agreed with Him in his Interpretations? But obſerve the Sequel: When the learned Doctor comes to explain his *own* Meaning of Αὐτόθεος, and *Subordinate*, it appears, from many broad Hints ſcatter'd here and there, to be this; that the Father only is *neceſſarily Exiſting* and ſtrictly *Divine*; The Son another Being, inferior in kind (or what comes to the ſame, a *Creature*) directly contrary to all the Antients. Thus you ſee, while the Doctor keeps in generals, and ſpeaks his mind but by Halves, He and the Antients may agree together; as He and We alſo do: But as ſoon as ever He comes to Particulars, and diſcovers his real and full Sentiments, there the Antients deſert Him; as well

well as He, Us. But besides this general Answer, give me leave to observe that, as to several particular Texts, The Doctor has no reason to pretend that the *Ante-Nicene* Writers in general, were on his Side. *Rev.* 1. 8. is one of the Doctor's Texts, which He interprets of the *Father*; and insists much upon it, that the Antients applied the Title of παντοκράτωρ, the *Almighty*, to the Father only. And yet nothing more certain than that That very Text was understood, by the *Ante-Nicene* Writers, in general, of God the Son: *Catholicks* and *Hereticks* Both agreed in it. The Text was urged against the *Catholicks*, in the *Sabellian* Controversy; and was as plausible a Text as any in the New Testament, on the *Sabellian* side: Yet the *Catholicks* admitted that it was to be understood of God the Son; and readily allowed, in Consequence of that Text, that the Son was ὁ παντοκράτωρ, the *Almighty*, as well as the Father. See * *Tertullian*, *Hippolytus*, and, probably, *Origen*, agreeing in this: The Doctor has not pretended to cite any *Ante-Nicene* Writer, who understood the Text otherwise; tho' He makes a show of having the *Antients* in general on his side, in this very Particular, (*Script. Doctr.* p. 63.) without proving any thing more than that the *Father* was *ordinarily* or *emphatically* stiled ὁ παντοκράτωρ, which is true, but not pertinent;

* Tertull. Contr. Prax. c. 17. Hippolyt. Contr. Noet. c. 6. p. 10. Orig. Ἀρχ. l. 1. c. 2. Athan. p. 554. 684. 762. Ed. Bened.

nor is it giving us the Sentiments of the *Antients*, with regard to this Text; but his *own*. *Joh.* 12. 41. is another noted Text, which the Doctor endeavors (*Script. Doctr.* p. 102.) to interpret in favour of his own *Hypotheſis*; and makes a ſhow of Authorities, as countenancing Him in it. But none of his Authorities come up to his Point: So far from it, that They are all againſt Him; as I have ſufficiently proved under *Query* the Second, and elſewhere. The like may be obſerved of the *Authorities* which He produces (p. 114, 115.) to confirm his Interpretation of *Act.* 7. 30, 31, 32. And I have, above, ſhown you as much of *Joh.* 10. 30. and other the like Texts; where you pretend to have ſome Countenance from the Antients, for your Interpretation. In ſhort; there is not a Text which the Doctor can pretend to urge in favor of his *main* Doctrine, and againſt Ours; and at the ſame time ſhow that the Antients agree with Him. As ſoon as ever you interpret any Text directly againſt the Divinity of Chriſt, as underſtood by Us in the ſtrict Senſe, you go off intirely from the *Antients*, and go on by your Selves. But enough of this.

In anſwer to the latter part of the Query, you obſerve that the Reaſon why the Doctor doth not admit the Teſtimonies of the *Fathers*, as *Proofs*, *is not becauſe They are againſt Him*; *but becauſe, tho' They are clearly for Him, yet, in Matters of Faith, He allows of no other Proof than the infallible Teſtimony of the Word of God.* One

One might be willing to believe this to have been the reaſon, why He *would not* admit Them as *Proofs*, if there were not another very plain one, why He *could not*; could not without inevitable Ruine and Deſtruction to his whole *Hypotheſis*. An Adverſary need not deſire any fairer Advantage of the learned Doctor, than to have the Iſſue of the Cauſe put upon the Doctor's Citations; taking in no more than is abſolutely neceſſary to clear the Senſe of the Authors, in thoſe very Paſſages. But waving this, let me ask you farther, why the Teſtimonies of Fathers may not be admitted as *Proofs*, Inferior or Collateral Proofs? If I can know from *Church-Writers*, and from *Scripture* too, what was believed by the Church (in ſundry Articles) from the Beginning; I have then two Proofs of the ſame Thing, tho' not Both equally Strong, or equally Authentick. The Proof from *Church-Writers* is an additional, inferior Proof; but ſtill a *Proof* it is, probable at leaſt, of ſomething, as to *Fact*; and not barely an *Illuſtration* of a *Dogma*, or Doctrine. Are we able to *prove* what were the Opinions of ſeveral Sects of *Philoſophers* from the Books which are extant; and may we not alſo prove what was the Faith of *Chriſtians*, in the ſame way, from the Books which They have left us? You add, *The Authority of the Fathers, could it be proved to be unanimous againſt Dr.* Clarke, *ought not to determine any Article of Faith.* No; But it is a ſtrong

preſumptive Proof, that his *Interpretation* of *Scripture* is not the true one: A Proof ſo conſiderable, that I know not whether any thing leſs than clear and evident Demonſtration ought to over-rule it. For, you muſt remember that Dr. *Clarke*, or any *Moderns*, as well as the *Antients*, are *fallible* Men; and have only the ſame *Human Reaſon* to work with, which others had Sixteen Hundred Years ago, in an Age of Miracles, and near to the Days of Inſpiration. *Moderns*, at ſo great a diſtance off, may, at leaſt, as eaſily miſtake, in interpreting Scripture, as you ſuppoſe the Antient and Univerſal Church to have done, in a momentous Article of Faith. Well then; ſuppoſing that we had been for ſome Time debating this very Point of the Bleſſed Trinity, on the Foot of Scripture: Mens Wits are ſo various, that ſeveral Interpretations may be invented of the ſame Texts; And perhaps none of them ſo manifeſtly abſurd, but that They poſſibly may be true; nor ſo manifeſtly right, but that They poſſibly may be wrong. What can we do better, in ſuch a Caſe, than appeal to thoſe who lived neareſt the Times of the inſpired Writers? Their Judgment, their Deciſions, and conſequent Practice, are at length the ſafeſt Rule to go by; at leaſt till you can ſhow us a better. *Scripture*, you'l ſay, is the *Rule*; and ſo ſay I. You bring your Scripture-Proofs; and I produce Mine. You have your Solutions of ſuch Difficulties as I preſs you with: I have Solu-

tions

tions too, and ſuch, to be ſure, as I think Sounder, Better, and Juſter than Your's: You think the very contrary. Thus far, it is combating Text with Text, Criticiſm with Criticiſm, Reaſon with Reaſon; and each ſide will think his own Superior. Now, ſuppoſe I can farther produce a Cloud of Witneſſes, a numerous Company of primitive Saints and Martyrs, confirming my Interpretation, concurring in my Sentiments, and corroborating my Reaſons: And ſuppoſe I find alſo that Thoſe, who took your Side of the Queſtion, were condemn'd by the generality as *Hereticks*, and *Corruptors* of the Faith of Chriſt; this will add ſuch Weight, Strength, and Force to my Pretenſions, that impartial Men will ſoon perceive, which is the moſt probable, which the ſafer ſide, and which it behoves them to cleave to. This is ſo agreeable to the common Senſe and Reaſon of Mankind; and the Advantage of having *Antiquity* of one's ſide is ſo apparent, that I'll venture to ſay, none ever talk'd againſt it, who did not ſuſpect, at leaſt, that *Antiquity* was againſt Them: And this I take to be one of your greateſt Misfortunes in this Controverſy; that you are ſenſible how much it would weaken your Cauſe to give up the *Fathers*; and yet, you are certain, in the reſult, to weaken it as much, by pretending to keep Them.

QUERY XXVIII.

Whether it be at all probable, that the primitive Church ſhould miſtake in ſo material a Point as this is; or that the whole Stream of Chriſtian Writers ſhould miſtake in telling us what the Senſe of the Church was; and whether ſuch a Cloud of Witneſſes can be ſet aſide without weakening the only Proof we have of the Canon of Scripture, *and the Integrity of the Sacred Text?*

IN Anſwer hereto, you admit that *the Teſtimony of the whole Stream of Antiquity is ſufficient to determine, in fact, what Faith the Church hath always profeſs'd and declar'd in her publick Forms.* I am content to put the Matter upon this Iſſue; and let the Point be decided from their Profeſſions in Baptiſm, Creeds, Doxologies, Hymns, which were publick Forms; and from publick Cenſures paſs'd upon *Hereticks*, which are as clear Evidence, as the other, of the Church's Faith at that Time. Only I would not exclude Collateral Proofs; ſuch as the declared Sentiments of Eminent Church Writers, the Interpretations of Creeds, left us by thoſe that recite Them; (ſuch as Thoſe of *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and Others) and Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, telling us, what the Tradition of the Church was, down to ſuch a Time.

From

From theſe put together, we have very clear and full Proof that the *Catholick* Church did all along profeſs a Trinity of *Conſubſtantial, Co-eternal* Perſons, in Unity of Nature, Subſtance and Godhead. This, the Incomparable Biſhop *Bull* has ſufficiently ſhown, in his *Defenſio Fidei Nicenæ*, *Judicium Eccleſiæ*, and *primitiva Traditio*. Biſhop *Stillingfleet* purſued the ſame Argument, with Variety of Learning, in his *Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, Chap. the 9*th*, which He concludes in theſe Words: "Taking the Senſe of thoſe "Articles, as the Chriſtian Church underſtood "them from the Apoſtles Times, then we have "as full and clear Evidence of this Doctrine, "as we have *that we received the Scriptures* "*from them*.. Dr. *Clarke*'s and Dr. *Whitby*'s Pretences, to the contrary, have been ſufficiently anſwer'd; partly by the learned Gentleman, who wrote the *True Scripture Doctrine Continued*, and partly by theſe Sheets. You have little to object, but that the *Fathers* did not aſſert an *individual Conſubſtantiality*, in your Senſe; which is true: And is no more than telling me, that They were not mad; when I contend that They were ſober.

But you add; the Queſtion is, whether, ſuppoſing the Fathers had unanimouſly declared for our Notion, *whether* (*in a Queſtion not of Fact, like that concerning the Canon of Scripture, but of Judgment and Reaſoning*) *ſuch a Teſtimony would prove that thoſe Scriptures*

ptures reveal it; or whether such an Interpretation of Scripture — would be as infallible as Scripture it self. But this is no Question at all between us. What we pretend is, that we have as good Proof of *the Doctrine of the Church*, as of the *Canon of Scripture*. Whether the Church, after the *Apostles*, was as infallible as the *Apostles* themselves, is quite another Question. We think it very unlikely that the *Apostolick* Churches should not know the mind of the *Apostles*; or should suddenly vary from it, in any Matter of Moment. We look upon it as highly improbable that the Faith of those Churches should so soon run counter to any thing in Scripture; since They had the best opportunities of knowing what Scripture meant; were made up of wise and good Men, Men who would sooner die than commit any Error in that kind, wilfully. Upon this, we believe the concurring Judgment of Antiquity to be, tho' not *infallible*, yet the *safest* Comment upon Scripture; and to have much more Weight in it, than there generally is in Wit and Criticism; and therefore not to be rejected, where the Words of Scripture will, with any propriety, bear that Interpretation. This is sufficient for us to say, or pretend. We have as plausible Arguments, to speak modestly, from *Scripture*, as you can pretend to have: Nay, we think your Notions utterly irreconcilable with Scripture, according to the natural, obvious, grammatical Construction of Words. And besides

beſides all this, we have, what you want, the concurring Senſe of the *Antients* plainly for us. The Queſtion then is not, whether *Scripture* and *Fathers* be equally infallible: All the *Fathers* together are not ſo valuable, or ſo credible, as any one inſpired Writer. But it is plainly this: Whether the Antient *Hereticks*, or *Catholicks*, as They have been diſtinguiſh'd, have been the beſt Interpreters of diſputed Texts; and whether we are now to cloſe in with the former, or the latter. You would inſinuate that you have *Scripture*, and we *Fathers* only: But we inſiſt upon it, that we have *Both*; as for many other Reaſons, ſo alſo for this, becauſe *Both*, very probably, went together: And as you certainly want one; ſo it is extremely probable that you have *neither*; for this very Reaſon, among many others, becauſe you have not *Both*. This Argument is of Force and Weight; and will hardly yield to any thing ſhort of *Demonſtration*; much leſs will it yield to ſuch ſort of Reaſonings as you are obliged to make uſe of, wanting better, to ſupport your *novel* Opinions.

The Sum of the whole Matter is this. The unanimous Senſe of the Antients, upon any Controverſial Point, is of great Moment and Importance towards fixing the Senſe of Scripture, and preventing its being ill-uſed by deſultorious Wits, who love to wander out of the common way; and can never want ſome colour for any Opinion almoſt whatever. We do

not

not appeal to the *Antients*, as if we could not maintain our Ground, from *Scripture* and *Reason*, againſt all Oppoſers: This has been done over and over. *Athanaſius*, *Hilary*, *Baſil*, the two *Gregories*, *Chryſoſtom*, *Auſtin*, *Cyril*, and Others, undertook the Cauſe on the Foot of Scripture; and were eaſily ſuperior to all the *Arians*. But ſince we have an Advantage, over and above Scripture Evidence, from the concurring Sentiments of Antiquity, we think it very proper to take That in alſo; and we ſhall not eaſily ſuffer it to be wreſted from us.

QUERY XXIX.

Whether private Reaſoning, in a matter above our Comprehenſion, be a ſafer Rule to go by, than the general Senſe and Judgment of the primitive Church, in the firſt 300 *Years; or, ſuppoſing it doubtful what the Senſe of the Church was within that time, whether what was determin'd by a Council of* 300 *Biſhops ſoon after, with the greateſt Care and Deliberation, and has ſatisfied Men of the greateſt Senſe, Piety and Learning, all over the Chriſtian World, for* 1400 *Years ſince, may not ſatisfy wiſe and good Men now?*

HERE you tell me, as uſual, when you have little elſe to ſay, that the *Council of Nice* knew nothing of *Individual* Conſubſtantiality:

ſtantiality: And then you add, pleaſantly, that you *turn the Query againſt the Queriſt, and lay claim to the Nicene Confeſſion.* What? Lay claim to a *Confeſſion* made in direct Oppoſition to the Men of your Principles? You ſay, if any Conſubſtantiality is to be found in that Creed, it is the *Specifick*, not *Individual.* And what if it were? Would that give you any claim to the *Nicene Confeſſion?* Are God and his Creatures *Conſubſtantial*, of the ſame rank, ſort, kind, or Species? You are forc'd to have recourſe to a *Figurative* Senſe, which Pretence I have obviated above. You are ſo kind to the *Queriſt*, as to be *willing to ſuppoſe and believe*, that He *is not Ignorant of the true and only Senſe of the word* ὁμοούσιος; meaning thereby the *Specifick* Senſe. In return, I'll be ſo juſt to you, as to ſay, that you underſtand the word very right: And yet the *Nicene Fathers* did not teach a *meerly* Specifick *Conſubſtantiality.* The word ὁμοούσιος expreſſes their Senſe; but not their *whole* Senſe, in that Article. It expreſſes an *Equality* of Nature, and ſignifies that the Son is as truly *Equal* in Nature to the Father, as one Man is *Equal* to another; or any individual Equal to another Individual of the ſame Sort or *Species.* And this was chiefly to be inſiſted on againſt the *Arians*, who denied ſuch *Equality*, making the *Son* a *Creature.* Wherefore the true Reaſon, to uſe Dr. *Cudworth*'s Words, only *mutandis mutandis*, why the *Nicene Fathers* laid ſo great a

ſtreſs

ſtreſs upon the ὁμοούσιον; was not becauſe this *alone* was ſufficient to make Father and Son *one God*; but becauſe They *could not be ſo without it.* * Ὁμοούσιος the Son muſt be, or He could not be God at all, in the ſtrict Senſe; and yet if He was barely ὁμοούσιος, like as one Human Perſon is to another, the *two* would be *two Gods.* And therefore the *Nicene Fathers*, not content to ſay only that the Son is ὁμοούσιος, inſert likewiſe, *God of God, Light of Light, Begotten*, &c. and, *of the Subſtance of the Father*; and this They are known to have declared over and over, to be *without any diviſion:* All which taken together expreſſes a great deal more than ὁμοούσιος would do alone; and are, as it were, ſo many qualifying Clauſes, on purpoſe to prevent any ſuch Miſconſtruction and Miſapprehenſion, as the word might otherwiſe be liable to. The good Fathers, like wiſe Men, at once maintain'd the *Equality of Nature*,

* Hi Tres, quia *Unius Subſtantiæ* ſunt, *Unum* ſunt; & *Summe* unum ſunt, ubi nulla Naturarum, nulla eſt diverſitas Voluntatum. Si autem *Naturæ Unum* eſſent, & Conſenſione non eſſent, non *Summe* unum eſſent: Si vero *Naturæ diſpares* eſſent, unum non eſſent. Hi ergo Tres, qui Unum ſunt propter ineffabilem Conjunctionem Deitatis, qua ineffabiliter Copulantur, *Unus Deus* eſt. *Aug. Contr. Maxim.* l. 2. p. 698.

This is very full to our purpoſe; and, by the way, may ſhow, how far St. Auſtin *was from* Sabellianiſm; *which ſome have weakly pretended to charge Him with. But there are many Paſſages in this Piece againſt* Maximin, *one of his very lateſt Pieces, full againſt* Sabellianiſm, *as well as againſt* Arianiſm. *I may juſt remark, that there is a deal of difference between* Unius Subſtantiæ, *and* Una Subſtantia. *Two Men are* Unius ejuſdemque Subſtantiæ, *not* una Subſtantia. *But the three Perſons are not only* unius Subſtantiæ, *but* una Subſtantia. *The* modern *Senſe of* Conſubſtantial *takes in Both.*

which

which ὁμοούσιος expresses, and the *Unity* of the Godhead too. Guarding equally against *Arianism*, and *Tritheism*, They took all prudent care to preserve the *Co-equality* of the two *Persons*, without *dividing* the *Substance*, which was what They intended. The learned Doctor * represents this Matter somewhat crudely. He observes upon the Words in the *Nicene Creed* (γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ, τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς) that the Son was not Himself that *individual Substance*, from which He was begotten. This He has so worded, that *individual Substance* with Him can only signify *individual Hypostasis*, or *Person:* And it is very true, that the Son is not *that Person*, from whom, or, of whom, He proceeded: But the *Substance* might be *undivided*, notwithstanding; which is all that any *Catholick* means by *individual Substance*. *But their meaning*, He says, *was*; *He was produced not from any other Substance* (*as Man was formed from the Dust of the Earth*) *but*, *after an ineffable manner*, *from the Substance of the Father only*. Here He leaves out the principal Thing, which the *Arians* asserted, and which the *Catholicks* guarded against, *viz. Not from Nothing*, not ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων. If therefore the Son, according to the *Nicene Fathers*, was not from any other Substance, besides the *Father*'s, nor from nothing; it is very plain that (unless They supposed a *Division* of Substance, which They absolutely

* Reply, p. 35.

reject)

reject) They ſuppoſed the Son to be of the ſame *undivided*, or *individual* Subſtance with the Father. As to the Suppoſition of his being produced from any other Subſtance (as *Adam* was form'd from the Duſt of the Earth) there was very little occaſion to guard againſt it: The Notion is, in it ſelf, too ſilly for any Man to own. The *Arians* themſelves (againſt whom the Creed was contriv'd) never pretended it, but * expreſly diſown'd it: Their noted Tenet was, that the Son was the *firſt* Thing made. The *Nicene Fathers* deſign'd chiefly, to guard againſt the Suppoſition of the Son's being *from nothing*, which was what the *Arians* inſiſted upon; They and the Catholicks equally believing it ridiculous to imagine any *Subſtance* to have been firſt made; and then the Son to have been made out of it. Wherefore, I humbly conceive, the true Reaſons why the *Nicene Fathers* were ſo very particular in the Words, τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, were, † firſt, to ſignify that They underſtood *Generation* in a *proper*, and not *figurative* Senſe; as the *Arians* did: And ſecondly withal to ‡ ſecure the *divine Unity*. For, if the Son were, *ab extra*, and *independent of the Father*; the *Alliance*, the

* Memorant Filium Dei neque ex aliqua ſubjacente materia genitum eſſe, quia per eum creata omnia ſint. *Hilar.* p. 832.

† Vid. Bull Def. F. N. p. 114, 115.

‡ Ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἀληθῶς γεγέννηται Θεὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ, Θεὸς ἀληθινὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ; οὐκ ἔξωθεν ὤν, ἀλλὰ ἐκ τῆς αὐτοῦ οὐσίας. Epiphan. p. 610.

Οὐχ' ὡς ἀρχὴ ἑτέρα καθ' ἑαυτὸν ὑφεστὼς, οὐδ' ἔξωθεν ταύτης γεγονὼς, ἵνα μὴ τῇ ἑτερότητι, δυαρχία γένηται. Athanaſ. Orat. 4. p. 617.

Οὐδὲ ἄλλος Θεὸς ὁ υἱός, οὐ γὰρ ἔξωθεν ἐπενοήθη. Orat. 3. p. 553.

Rela-

Relation, the *Unity* of the Persons, in the same Godhead, had (upon their Principles) been lost; and *Ditheism* unavoidable.

This may be enough to satisfy you, that, whatever the word ὁμοούσιος may commonly signify, yet the *Nicene* Fathers meant a great deal more than a *Specifick* Unity; if not by that word, singly consider'd, yet by that taken together with the rest, which were put in to explain it. The word may indifferently serve to express an *Equality* of Nature, whether the *Hypostases* be *undivided*, or whether They have a *separate Existence*. It was therefore properly enough applied, in the Creed: And care was taken that both *Generation*, and *Consubstantiality*, should be understood in a Sense suitable to Things *divine*; that is, taking from the *Idea* all that is low, mean, and imperfect; and applying only so much as might comport with the Majesty, Dignity, and Perfections of the adorable and incomprehensible Trinity.

You seem to be apprehensive, that you must, at length, be obliged to give up the *Nicene* Creed, as utterly inconsistent with your Principles; as indeed it is. And therefore, in the next place, you endeavour to lessen the Credit of it; alledging, that *the Council of* Antioch *before, and the Council of* Ariminum, *and other Councils, after (some of Them with a greater Number of Bishops than met at* Nice) *determin'd against the* ὁμοούσιος. The Objection drawn from the Determination of the Council

of *Antioch*, about Sixty Years before the Council of *Nice*, you find largely anſwer'd by *Biſhop *Bull*. They condemn'd the word, as it had been miſunderſtood and miſapplied by *Paul* of *Samoſata*; but eſtabliſh'd the very ſame Doctrine with the *Nicene Fathers*. I may anſwer you briefly, upon your own Principles. You ſay, *Paul* of *Samoſata* was condemn'd for holding ὁμοούσιον, in the Senſe of *individual* Conſubſtantiality (*p.* 118.) which, if it be true, was reaſon good enough for condemning Him; as you underſtand *Individual*, that is, in a *Sabellian* Senſe. The Remark of *Hilary*, who goes upon the ſame Suppoſition which you do, may here be pertinently †cited; and may ſerve as a ſufficient Anſwer. It is obſervable that *Hilary* makes the Number of Biſhops in the *Antiochian* Council no more than 80; *Athanaſius*, but 70; *Euſebius*, an indefinite Number, very many. It does not appear that They were near ſo conſiderable as the famous Council of *Nice* of 318 Biſhops.

You next mention the Council of *Ariminum*; and give a hint of *other Councils*. It would have been but fair to have told us what *other Councils* you meant, which had, as you ſay, a *greater Number* of Biſhops than met at *Nice*.

* Def. F. N. p. 29, *&c.* *See alſo Mr.* Thirlby. *Anſw. to* Whiſton, p. 103. *Defence*, p. 96.

† Male intelligitur Homouſion: quid ad me bene intelligentem? Male Homouſion Samoſatenus Confeſſus eſt: Sed nunquid Melius Arii negaverunt? Octoginta Epiſcopi olim reſpuerunt; ſed Trecenti & decem octo nuper receperunt. *Hilar. de Synod.* p. 1200.

You

You know, I presume, or at least might know, that you cannot name One, besides the *Council* of *Ariminum*; which I shall speak to presently.

In your Appendix (p. 154.) You say the Determination of the *Council* of *Nice*, for the ὁμοούσιος, was rejected by a *greater Council* than that of *Nice*, met at *Jerusalem*. But in these few Words, you have two Mistakes; or at least, you have said what you cannot prove. * *Eusebius*'s Words, which you refer to, may mean no more than this, that the *Council* of *Jerusalem* was the greatest He had known, since the Famous one of *Nice*. Your other mistake is, that *They rejected the Determination of the Council of* Nice, *&c.* How doth this appear? Did They say a word against it? Or did They make any Declaration against either the Council of *Nice*, or the Ὁμοούσιος? Not a Syllable. But † They received *Arius* to Communion; partly upon the good Emperor's Recommendation, who believed Him to have recanted, and to have come in to the ‡ true *Catholick*

* De Vita Constant. l. 4. c. 47. p. 454. *See* Valesius's *Notes.*

† *See the History in* Socrat. l. 1. c. 33. Sozom. l. 2. c. 27. Athanas. p. 734.

‡ Arius *swore to the* Emperor, *calling God to Witness, that He believed in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as the* whole Catholick *Church taught. Which the Emperor could take in no other Sense, but as it had been lately determin'd by the* Catholick Nicene *Fathers. See* Sozom. l. 2. c. 27.

And this may farther appear by the Emperor's *putting* Arius *to the Test afterwards, to see whether He really acknowledged the* Nicene *Faith or no. See* Socrat. l. 1. c. 38.

Faith, as eſtabliſh'd at the Council of *Nice*; and partly upon *Arius*'s [a] own *Confeſſion of Faith*, which was ſo plauſibly worded, that it might eaſily paſs for *Orthodox*, tho' it wanted the word ὁμοούσιος. Now, is it not very unaccountable in you to call this Rejecting the Determination for the ὁμοούσιος, when it was only receiving a Man, ſuppoſed by the *Emperor*, and perhaps by many of the Council, to have repented of his *Hereſy*, and to have embraced every Thing that the *Nicene Council* had determin'd; the very Senſe and Meaning of Ὁμοούσιος it ſelf, tho' not the Word.

Paſs we on now to the Council of *Ariminum*, in the Year 359. when the *Arians* had the *ſecular* Power on their ſide, and made uſe of it, with all imaginable Severity. The whole Number of Biſhops in Council are computed at about [b] 400, and [c] not above Eighty of Them *Arians*. [d] All the *Catholicks*, at firſt, declared their unanimous Adherence to the *Nicene* Creed; and proteſted againſt any new Form of Faith. All manner of Artifices, Frauds, and Menaces were contrived to bring Them and the *Arians* to ſomething like an Agreement. Yet the utmoſt They could do, was only to bring the *Catholicks* to ſubſcribe a [e] *Confeſſion*

a Extat. in Sozom. l. 2. c. 27.

b Sulpic. Sev. p. 267. Athanaſ. p. 720. Maximin *the* Arian *makes the whole Number* 330. Auguſt. Collat. Tom. 8. p. 650.

c Sulpic. Sever. p. 269. d Hilar. Fragm. p. 1341.

e Quæ Catholicam diſciplinam, perfidia latente, loqueretur. Sulpic. p. 273.

artfully

artfully worded in general Terms. And no sooner did the *Catholick* Fathers, after their Return Home, perceive how They had been imposed upon by ambiguous Terms, and overreach'd by Craft and Subtilty; but They * confess'd their Error, and repented of it with Tears. The History of the Council at large is too tedious for me to recite Here: It may be seen either in the original Authors, *Athanasius*, *Sulpicius Severus*, *Hilary*, *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, *Theodorit*, and *Jerom*; or with less Trouble, and in less Compass, in *Cave*'s Life of *Athanasius*, or lastly in *Montfaucon*'s. When you have well consider'd the Arts and Practices of the *Arians*, much the smaller Number, in that Council, you may perhaps see reason to be ashamed of having mention'd it, but no reason for opposing it to the celebrated *Nicene Council*. While the Council of *Ariminum* was free, and left to give their real Opinions; the *Arians* were condemn'd by a great Majority, and their *Principals deposed*. Even, at last, you have no Reason to boast of their unanimous Agreement to a new Faith. It was a *verbal* Agreement only, to Expressions seemingly *Catholick*: And probably, the *Majority* departed with the same high value and opinion of the *Nicene Faith*, which They brought with Them. Four Years after the Synod of *Arimi-*

* Vid. Ep. Liber apud Socr. l. 4. p. 183. Hieron. Contr. Lucif. Dial. Sulpic. Sever.

num, * *Athanasius* reckons up particularly the Churches which still embraced the *Nicene* Faith. Those of *Spain*, *Britain*, *Gaul*, all *Italy*, *Dalmatia*, *Dacia*, *Mysia*, *Macedonia*, *Greece*, *Africa*, *Sardinia*, *Cyprus*, *Crete*, *Pamphylia*, *Lycia*, *Isauria*, *Egypt*, *Libya*, *Pontus*, *Cappadocia*, and the Churches of the East; excepting a few that followed *Arius*. He calls them the *whole World*, and *all* the Churches throughout the World. He declares that He *knows* it, and has their *Letters* by Him to prove it. And it is worth reciting what account the Bishops of *Egypt* and *Libya*, and among Them *Athanasius*, give of the extent of the *Nicene* Faith, about Ten Years after the time that you pretend there was a *general Council* against it. Writing to the Bishops in *Africa*, They begin thus: "† It is the greatest "Satisfaction to us to have seen what *Damasus* our Fellow-Minister, and Bishop of the "great City of *Rome*, and such a Number of "Bishops in Council with Him, besides other

* Athanas. Ep. ad Jovian. pag. 781. Theod. E. H. l. 4. c. 3. *See* Liberius's *Letters* An. 367. apud Socrat. l. 4. c. 12. Damasus's *Lett.* Sozom. l. 6. c. 23.

Hoc est illud *Homousion*, quod in Concilio Nicæno adversus Hæreticos Arianos, a Catholicis Patribus, Veritatis Auctoritate, & Auctoritatis Veritate firmatum est: quod postea in *Concilio Ariminensi* (propter novitatem verbi, minus quam potuit intellectam, quod tamen Fides Antiqua repererat) *multis Paucorum Fraude* deceptis, Hæretica Impietas sub Hæretico Imperatore labefactare tentavit. Sed post non longum Tempus, Libertate Fidei Catholicæ prævalente, —— Homousion Catholicæ Fidei Sanitate *longe lateque* defensum est. *August.* Tom. 8. p. 704.

† Apud Athanas. p. 891.

Synods

" Synods in *Gaul* and *Italy*, hath wrote in " Defence of the true Orthodox Faith: That " Faith, which Christ delivered, and the Apo- " stles taught, and our Fathers assembled at " *Nice*, from out of the whole Christian World, " handed down to us. So intense was their Zeal " at that Time, in regard to the *Arian* He- " resy; that They who had fallen into it, might " be reclaim'd; and that the Heads or Authors " of it might have a Mark set upon Them. " To this Determination (*of the Nicene Fa-* " *thers*) formerly the whole Christian World " consented: And at this very Time, many " Councils have confirm'd and publish'd the " same: By means of which all They of *Dal-* " *matia*, *Dardania*, *Macedonia*, *Epirus*, " *Greece*, *Crete*, and the other Islands, *Sicily*, " *Cyprus* and *Pamphylia*, *Lycia*, *Isauria*, all " *Egypt*, the two *Libyas*, and the most of " *Arabia* have acknowledged it. They go on to set forth the great Respect and Veneration due to the Decisions of the *Nicene* Council; and show how far it was preferable, in every respect, to all the *Arian* Synods; and particularly to the pretended general Council of *Ariminum*, which some presumed, at that Time of Day, to set against it. The whole would be well worth the Reader's perusal, and thither I refer you, for a more particular Answer; that you may learn hereafter, not to call every Thing *hugely Romantick*, which may have happen'd to escape your Notice or Observation.

I must take leave to tell you, there never was a Synod on your side, so free, so large, so, in every respect, unexceptionable as the *Council of Nice* was. Nay farther; that whatever Opposition was made to it, was carried on with such Wiles, Crafts, Subtilties, and refined Artifices, as every Honest Man should be ashamed of: And farther, that, notwithstanding all They could do, the *Arians* were not able long to maintain their Ground; but the Men who sustain'd the Shock, and kept up the Credit of the *Nicene* Creed, were not only the most numerous, but appear to have been as wise, as judicious, and as pious Men, as ever the Church was adorned with, since the Times of the Apostles.

I do not pretend that there is Demonstration in this kind of Reasoning, in favor of any Cause. But it will have its Weight with cool and considering Men; Who reflecting, that Religion is not a Thing to be coin'd, and recoin'd every Month; that it has been thought on long and well, and by Persons bless'd with as good a Share of Understanding, and as great Sincerity as any are, or have been; and that the generality of the wisest and most excellent Men, have hitherto gone on in such a way, and that too after a strict and severe Examination, being well apprized of the Objections made against it; I say, who, reflecting thus, will be very cautious of Contradicting what seems to have been so well, and so deliberately settled; and will be rather

rather willing to suspect their own Judgment, and modestly decline what looks like leaning too much to their own Understandings. However, such Considerations may be of use to Those who, not having Leisure, Inclination, or Patience to examine throughly into this Controversy (as perhaps few have) must be content to judge as They can: And since They find the same Scriptures so very differently interpreted by the contending Parties, till They can Themselves enter into the very Heart of the Controversy, how can They do better than close in with Those, who have been in Possession of this Faith for so many Centuries, and have had, in a manner, in every Age, for at least Fourteen Hundred Years, I will venture to say, Sixteen, the most eminent Lights and Ornaments of the Christian Church, to support and defend it? This I mention as the safest way; and such as will be taken by modest, humble, and discreet Men; being what They can best answer to God, and their own Consciences, even tho', at length, it should prove Erroneous; which yet has not hitherto, nor ever will be, I am perswaded, made appear. As for Those who chuse to go out of the common Road, and to run Counter to all that has hitherto been called, and reputed *Catholick*, or *Orthodox*; let Them look to it, and be it at their own Peril. They must believe that the Antient *Hereticks* were the Soundest Christians; that the first general Council which met from all

Parts

Parts of *Chriſtendom*, and having no byaſs, ſo far as appears, to determine Them this way, or that, either did not know what was the Faith of their reſpective Churches, and what had been handed down to them by their Predeceſſors, or elſe wilfully and unanimouſly agreed to corrupt it; and that too in a very material Article, in which the ſumm of the Chriſtian Religion is contain'd; and in which the Nature and Object of our Worſhip is very nearly concern'd. They muſt believe farther that the Churches, in general, throughout the Chriſtian World, through every Age (and even ſince the Reformation, upon which Matters were ſtrictly look'd into, and carefully re-examin'd) have fallen into the ſame Error; and ſo continue, even to this Day; ſome few private Men only, here and there, ſhowing their diſlike of it. Now, They who pretend this, muſt bring ſome very ſtrong Proofs to make good their Pretences. If They have not ſomething very Weighty and Momentous to urge; ſomething that carries the Force and Evidence of *Demonſtration* with it, They are firſt very unreaſonable in calling us to attend to what ſo little deſerves it; and next very inexcuſable in their Attempts to draw others into their *precarious* Sentiments, and to raiſe Doubts and Perplexities in the Minds of ſimple well-meaning Men. But I paſs on to.

QUERY XXX.

Whether, supposing the Case doubtful, it be not a wise Man's part to take the safer Side; rather to think too highly, than too meanly of our Blessed Saviour; rather to pay a modest deference to the Judgment of the Antient and Modern Church, than to lean to one's own Understanding?

UPON the Question, whether it be not safer and better (supposing the Case doubtful) to think too highly, rather than too meanly of our Blessed Saviour; you answer, *questionless it is*; which one might think a very fair and ingenuous Confession; and you need not have added a word more. You go on to say, that this is our *most plausible Pretence*; in which, I think, you do it a deal too much Honour. I did but just hint it; and lest it should not be of force sufficient, immediately strengthen'd it with another Consideration; which I am perswaded will bear, if this should not; and the rather, because you have not thought fit so much as to take notice of it. I must however follow you, upon the former Point, that *plausible* Plea, and which is so just, that you seem your self to give into it. Yet, I know not how, by some peculiar turn of Thought, you at length come to say, that it *proves as weak and false as any other they ever*

ever alledge. If it prove no *weaker*, I ſhall be ſatisfied. Let us hear what you have to ſay. Your Argument is this: *Since Revelation is the only rule in the Caſe, if we go beyond, or if we fall ſhort, are we not equally culpable?* I am very glad to hear from you, that *Revelation* is the *only* rule in the Caſe. Abide by that, and Matters may eaſily be adjuſted. To the Argument I anſwer: That you *equivocate* in the word *Equally*, and make a *Sophiſtical* Syllogiſm with four Terms; *Equally* culpable, ſignifies, either that one is culpable *as well* as the other, or that one is culpable *as much* as the other; *equally* a Fault, or an *equal* Fault. Our diſpute is about the *latter*, and yet all that you really prove is only the *former*. *Revelation* undoubtedly is the Rule, and to go beyond it is certainly culpable, as well as it is to fall ſhort of it; and yet not *culpable* (at leaſt not in this Inſtance) in the ſame Degree. Is there no ſuch Thing as an Error on the right Hand (as we ſay) or a Fault on the right Side? Of two Extremes, may it not often happen, that one is more dangerous than the other? This I aſſert to be the Caſe here: And I will give you my Reaſons for it. Our Bleſſed Lord hath done great and wonderful Things for us. If our Reſpect, Duty, and Gratitude happen, through our Ignorance and exceſſive Zeal, to riſe too high; this is the overflowing of our good-natured Qualities, and may ſeem a pitiable Failing. But, on the other Hand, if we happen

pen to fall short in our Regards, there is not only Ingratitude, but *Blasphemy* in it. It is degrading, and dethroning our Maker, Preserver, King, and Judge; and bringing Him down to a level with his Creatures.

Besides; we have many express Cautions given us in Scripture, not to be wanting in our Respects and Services towards God the Son; but have no particular Cautions against Honouring Him too much. We know that we ought to *Honour Him, even as we Honour the Father*; which, if it be an ambiguous Expression, we are very excusable in taking it in the best Sense, and interpreting on the side of the Precept. We know that by dishonouring the Son, we do, at the same Time, dishonour the Father: But we are no where told, that the Father will resent it as a dishonour done to Himself, if we should chance, out of our scrupulous Regards to the Father and Son Both, to pay the Son more Honour than strictly belongs to Him. On these, and the like Considerations (especially when we have so many, and so great Appearances of Truth, and such a Cloud of Authorities to countenance us in it) the Error, if it be one, seems to be an Error on the right Hand. Now you shall be heard again. *Can any Man think to please the Son of God, by giving that to Him, which He never claim'd or could claim?* Positive enough. But will you please to remember that the Query *supposes the Case doubtful* (which was abundantly civil to you)

doubt-

doubtful whether the Son of God has *claim'd it*, or no; and the whole Argument runs upon that Suppoſition. This therefore diſcovers either ſome want of Acumen, or great Marks of Haſte. You add: *It can be no Detraction from the Dignity of any Perſon (how great ſoever that Dignity be) to forbear profeſſing Him to be that which He really is not.* I perceive, your Thoughts are ſtill abſent; and you do not reflect, that you are begging the Queſtion, inſtead of anſwering to the Point in Hand. You are to *ſuppoſe* it, if you pleaſe, *doubtful*, who, or what, the Perſon is. In ſuch a Caſe, it may be better to give Him what He does not require, than to defraud Him of what He does: It is ſafer and more prudent to run the Risk of one, than of the other. You go on: *It may well become ſerious and ſincere Chriſtians to conſider whether it is not poſſible that while, adventuring to be wiſe beyond what is written, they vainly think to advance the Honour of the Son of God, above what He has given them Ground for in the Revelation, They may diſhonour the Father that ſent Him*, &c. I am weary of tranſcribing. Conſider, on the other Hand, whether it be not more than *poſſible*, that, while others *adventuring to be wiſe beyond what is written* (teaching us to profeſs *three Gods*, making the *Creator* of the World a *Creature*, inventing new *unſcriptural* Diſtinctions of a *ſupreme* and a *ſubordinate* Worſhip,

ſhip, with many other Things equally *unſcriptural* and unwarrantable) They *vainly* think to bring down *Myſteries* to the level of their low Underſtandings, and to ſearch the *deep Things of God*; They may not diſhonour both Father and Son, and run into Hereſy, Blaſphemy, and what not, and Sap the very Foundations of the Chriſtian Religion. You proceed: *It may become Them to conſider what They will anſwer at the* great Day, *ſhould God charge Them with not obſerving that Declaration of His, I will not give my Glory to another.* They may humbly make Anſwer, that They underſtood that *His Glory* was not to be given to *Creatures*; and therefore They had given it to none but his own Son, and his H. Spirit, whom They believed not to be *Creatures*; and whom Himſelf had given his Glory to, by commanding all Men to be *baptized* in their Names, equally with his own; and ordering particularly, that *all Men ſhould Honour the Son, even as They Honour the Father.* If They happen'd to carry their Reſpect too high; yet it was towards thoſe only, whom the Father principally delighteth to Honour; and towards whom an ingenuous, grateful, and well-diſpoſed Mind can hardly ever think He can pay too much. Upon theſe and the like Conſiderations They may humbly hope for Pity and Pardon for a Miſtake; ſuch an one as the humbleſt, moſt devout, and moſt conſcientious Men might be the apteſt to fall into.

But

But what must an *Arian* have to say, at that *great Day*, if it appears that He has been uttering *Blasphemies* against the Son of God, and reviling his Redeemer (the generality of sober Christians looking on, all the while, with Horror; shock'd at the Impiety; and openly declaring and protesting against it) and for no other Reasons, in the last Result, but because He thought *Generation* implied *Division*, and *necessary* Generation implied outward *Co-action*; and He could not understand whether the Unity should be called *Specifick* or *Individual*; nor *how* there came to be three Persons; nor *why* One might not have been as good as Three; nor *why* the Father should be said to beget the Son, rather than *vice versa*; and the like? Is this kind of reasoning suitable to, or becoming *Christians*, who have their Bible to look into; which alone can give any Satisfaction in these Matters? To go upon our own Fancies and Conjectures, in a Thing of this Nature, is only betraying too little Reverence for the tremendous and unsearchable Nature of God, and too high an Opinion of our own Selves. You have a farther Pretence, built upon your mistaken Notion of *individual*; which I need not take notice of, having already almost surfeited the Reader with it

QUERY

Query XXXI.

Whether any thing less than clear and evident Demonstration, *on the side of* Arianism, *ought to move a wise and good Man, against so great Appearances of Truth, on the side of* Orthodoxy, *from* Scripture, Reason, *and* Antiquity: *And whether we may not wait long before we find such* Demonstration?

IN your Answer to this, I am rebuked, first, for giving the Name of *Orthodoxy*, to a *Scholastick* Notion: And secondly, for calling your Doctrine *Arianism*. As to the first, I stand so far corrected, as to beg the privilege of using the word *Orthodoxy*, for the *Received Doctrine*. You are pleased to call it a *Scholastick* Notion. How far it is *Scholastick*, I do not certainly know; But sure I am that it is Primitive and *Catholick:* And I do not know that the *School-men* were *Hereticks* in this Article. If They were; So far, you may depend upon it, our Notion is not *Scholastick*. As to your Doctrine being justly call'd *Arianism*, I hope, without Offence, I may say, I have made it plain to a Demonstration (excepting only that, in some Particulars, you fall below *Arianism*) and I should advise you hereafter, for your own sake, to dispute so clear a Point no farther. But let us go on. You add: *If it be impossible, by the Rule of Scripture*

and Reaſon, and the Senſe of the moſt antient Writers, and Councils of the Church, that the Scholaſtick *Notion ſhould be true; and if there be no* Medium *betwixt* (the Scholaſtick Notion) *and the Notion of Dr.* Clarke (that is Arianiſm) *then it will be demonſtrated that* (Arianiſm) *is the true Doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles, as revealed in Scripture, and the true Senſe of Scripture interpreted by right Reaſon, and as underſtood by the beſt and moſt antient Chriſtian Writers.* This is your *Demonſtration*; only I have thrown in a word or two, by way of Parentheſis, to make it the clearer to the Reader. The ſumm of it is this; if the *Scholaſtick* Notion (by which you mean *Sabellianiſm*) be not true; and if there be no *Medium* between *Sabellianiſm* and *Arianiſm*; then *Arianiſm* is the True Doctrine, *&c.* That is, if *ſuppoſing* be *proving*, and if *begging the Queſtion* be the ſame thing with *determining* it; then ſomething will be *demonſtrated*, which is not *demonſtrated*. You do well to refer us to your *Appendix* for proof, and to ſhift it off as far as poſſible. *Demonſtrations* are good Things, but ſometimes very hard to come at; as you'l find in the preſent Inſtance. You may take as much time longer, as you think proper, to conſider of it. Give me a *Demonſtration*, juſtly ſo called; a chain of clear Reaſoning, beginning from ſome plain and undoubted Axiom, and regularly deſcending by neceſſary Deductions,

or

or close Connexion of *Ideas*, till you come at your *Conclusion*. Till you can do this, it will be but labour lost, to endeavor to shake the *Received Doctrine* of the ever blessed *Trinity*. For, unless you can give us something really Solid and Substantial, in an Article of so great Importance, the Reasons which we have, on our side of the Question, are so many, so plain, and so forcible, that they must, and will, and ought to sway the Minds of modest, reasonable, and conscientious Men; while the Church stands, or the World lasts. Any Man that duly considers what we have to plead from Holy Scripture, and what from the concurring Judgment and Practice of the Primitive and Catholick Church; and reflects farther upon the natural Tenderness which every pious and grateful Mind must have for the Honour of his Blessed Lord and Saviour, the Dread and Horror of Blasphemy, and how shocking a Thing it must appear to begin now to abridge Him of that Respect, Service, and supreme Adoration, which has been so long, and so universally paid Him, and by the blessed Saints and Martyrs now crown'd in Heaven; I say, any Man that duly considers this, will easily perceive how impossible it is for *Arianism* ever to prevail generally among Christians, except it be upon one or other of these Suppositions: Either that the Age becomes so very *Ignorant* or *Corrupt*, that They know not, or care not, what They do; or that some new Light spring

up on the side of *Arianism*, some hidden reserve of extraordinary Evidences, such as, in 1400 Years Time, the Wit of Man has not been able to discover. As to the latter, neither your self, nor yet the learned Doctor has been pleased to favour us with any such Discovery: As to the former, I have too good an opinion of you to suspect, that you can either hope, or wish for it. You will have a mind to try what you can do: And so give me leave to represent to you a short Summary of what we are to expect of you.

1. You are to prove, either that the Son is *not Creator*; or that there are *two Creators*, and one of Them a *Creature*.

2. You are to show, either that the Son is not to be *worship'd* at all; or that there are *two Objects* of *Worship*, and one of Them a *Creature*.

3. You are to prove, either that the Son is not *God*; or that there are *two Gods*, and one of Them a *Creature*.

4. You are to show, that your *Hypothesis* is high enough to take in all the high Titles and Attributes ascribed to the Son in Holy Scripture; And, at the same time low enough to account for his *increasing in Wisdom*, *not knowing the Day of Judgment*, His being *exceeding sorrowful*, *troubled*, *crying out in his Agonies*, and the like. You are to make all to meet in the one Λόγος, or *Word*; or else to mend your Scheme by borrowing from ours.

5. I

5. I must add; that, whatever you undertake, you are either to prove it with such Strength, Force, and Evidence, as may be sufficient to bear up against the Stream of Antiquity, full and strong against you; or else to show that Antiquity has been much misunderstood, and is *not* full and strong against you.

Now you see, what you have to do; and our Readers, perhaps, may understand what we are talking about, the Dust being, I hope, in some measure thrown off, and the Cause open'd. Now proceed, as you think proper: Only dispute fair; drop ambiguous Terms or define Them; put not gross Things upon us; contemn every Thing but Truth in the search after Truth; and keep close to the Question: And then it will soon be seen, whether *Arianism*, or *Catholicism*, is the *Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity*.

There remain two only *Queries*, which I have any concern in; and I hardly think it needful to take farther notice of them, the Substance of them being contain'd in the former: Besides that this *Defense* being drawn out into a length beyond what I expected, I am willing to come to a Conclusion. You'l excuse me for not returning a particular Answer to *your* Queries, having obviated all that is of weight in Them, in this *Defense* of my *own*. Besides, you have now had some Years to consider this Subject, and may probably see reason to alter some Things; to contract your *Queries*

into a ſhorter Compaſs, and to put them cloſer and ſtronger: Tho' that part, I think, ſhould come, after you have made a *Defenſe* of your own Principles: Otherwiſe, you know, it is nothing but finding Faults, without propoſing any way to mend Them; which is only a work of Fancy, and is both fruitleſs, and endleſs. My deſign chiefly was to be upon the *Offenſive:* The *Defenſive* Part, on our ſide, has been handled over and over, in Books well known, and eaſy to be had. What was moſt wanting was, to point out the particular Defects of Dr. *Clarke*'s Scheme, which was thought to contain ſomething *new*; and was certainly ſet forth in a very *new* Method.

In Concluſion, give me leave to tell you, that I have enter'd into this Cauſe (after a competent weighing of what I could meet with, on either ſide) under a full Conviction both of the Truth and Importance of it; and with a Reſolution (by God's Aſſiſtance) to maintain it; till I ſee Reaſon (which I deſpair of) to alter my Judgment of it. Make you the beſt you can of your ſide of the Queſtion, in a *rational* and *fair* manner. Truth is what I ſincerely aim at, whether it be on your Side, or on mine. But I may be allowed to ſpeak with the greater Confidence in this Cauſe, ſince the Controverſy is not *new*, but has been exhauſted long ago; and all had been done on your Side, that the Wit of Man could do, long before either You, or Dr. *Clarke* appear'd in it. You

may,

may, if you please, traverse over again *Scripture*, *Antiquity*, and *Reason*. As to the first; all the Texts you can pretend to bring against us, have been weigh'd and consider'd; and we have Solutions ready for them; while you are yet to seek how to give a tolerable Account of several Texts; those, especially, which declare the *Unity* of God, and proclaim the Son to be *God*, *Creator*, and an *Object* of *Worship* and *Adoration*. If you proceed to *Fathers*, They stand pointed against you; and you are certain to expose your Cause, as often as you hope for any Relief or Succour from Them. If lastly (which you think your strongest Hold) you retire to *Philosophy* and *Metaphysicks*, I humbly conceive, you will still be able to do nothing. It will be only falling to *Conjecture*, after you fail of *Proof*; and giving the World your *Wishes*, when They look'd for *Demonstrations*. I do not expect you should believe one Word of what I have now said; neither say I it to discourage any *rational* Inquiries; let Truth have its utmost Trial, that it may afterwards Shine out with greater Lustre: Only let not your *Zeal* out-run your *Proofs*. If your Arguments have Weight sufficient to carry the Point with Men of Sense, let us have Them in their full Strength; all reasonable Men will thank you for Them. But if, failing in *Proof*, you should condescend (which yet I am perswaded you will not) to Wile and Stratagem, to Colours and Disguises, to Misrepre-

ſentation and Sophiſtry, in hopes to work your way among the unlearned and unthinking Part of the World; Then let me aſſure you beforehand, that That Method will not do. Every Man, that has a Spark of generous Fire left, will riſe up againſt ſuch Practices; and be filled with Diſdain to ſee Parts and Learning ſo proſtituted, and Readers ſo uſed.

I am, SIR, *your*

Friend and Servant.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

I Have juſt run over the Second Edition of Dr. *Clarke*'s *Scripture-Doctrine*; where I obſerve, that moſt of the Paſſages which I have animadverted upon, ſtand as They did, without any Correction or Amendment. Where the Doctor has attempted any Thing, which may ſeem to weaken the Force of what I have offer'd above, I ſhall here take notice of it. I had noted (as the learned Mr. *Welchman* had done before me) the Doctor's unfair manner of ſuppreſſing ſome Words of *Chryſoſtom*, which were neceſſary to let the Reader into the Author's true meaning. The Doctor here endeavors * to bring Himſelf off, by ſaying, that the Words left out are *Chryſoſtom's own Inference, and not the Explication of the Words of the Text.* But the Truth is; *Chryſoſtom*'s Inference ſhows plainly

* Pag. 92.

what

what his *Explication* of the Text was; which *Explication* represented separately without that *Inference*, by the Help of the Doctor prefacing it, was made to appear in another Light, and to speak another Sense than what the Author intended. *One in Power* (κατὰ δύναμιν) is the same, with *Chrysostom*, as *equal* in Power or Ability, and *essentially* so. He could never have imagined, that *one in Power* should signify no more than the Doctor pretends. One having *infinite* and the other only *finite* Power, could not, according to *Chrysostom*, be properly said to be one, κατὰ δύναμιν, *in Power*. His Interpretation then, being not only different but contrary to the Doctor's, should not have been represented in such a Manner (by suppressing a part of it) as to be made to appear to countenance a Notion, which it clearly contradicts.

The learned Doctor * has put in an Explanatory *Parenthesis* to his Translation of a Passage of *Irenæus*. I have took notice † above, that the Doctor had not done Justice to *Irenæus*, in that Passage: And I am glad to find that the Doctor Himself is now sensible of it. He has not yet come up to the full Sense of the Author; as you may perceive, by comparing what He hath said with what I have remark'd above. But He has said as much as could be expected of Him: The wiser way

* Pag. 94. † Pag. 430.

would

would have been, to have struck the Quotation out of his Book.

Pag. 248. The learned Doctor Criticizes a Passage of St. *Austin*; which I am obliged to take notice of, having made use of that Passage in these Sheets: * I will give you the Doctor's own Words, that you may be the better able to judge of the Matter. After He had cited several Passages out of *Justin Martyr*, where, probably, the good Father was speaking of the Temporary προβόλευσις, or *Manifestation*, or *Generation* of God the Son, He proceeds thus. "*Note:* In all these Passages, the words κατὰ "βουλὴν, and βουλῇ, and θελήσει, and δυνάμει, signify "evidently, not *volente*, but *voluntate*; not "the mere *Approbation*, but the *Act* of the "*Will*. And therefore St. *Austin* is very *un-*"*fair*, when He *confounds* these *two* Things, "and asks (*utrum Pater sit Deus, Volens* "an *Nolens*) whether *the Father Himself be* "*God, with or without his own Will*? The "Answer is clear: He is God (*Volens*) *with* "the Approbation of his Will; but not *volun-*"*tate*, not κατὰ βουλὴν, not βουλῇ, θελήσει, and "δυνάμει, not by an *Act* of his Will, but by "*Necessity of Nature*. Thus far the learned Doctor; who has made such strange and unaccountable Misrepresentation, that a *Friend* would hardly know what kind excuse to make for Him. I pass by his gross Mis-

* Pag. 126.

con-

construction of *Justin Martyr*, and his Insinuation (grounded upon it) that the Son became *God*, by an *Act* of the *Father*'s *Will*. Admitting it were so; how is St. *Austin* concern'd in this Matter, and how comes in the Doctor's *Therefore*, where there is no manner of Connexion? Was St. *Austin* Commenting upon *Justin Martyr*? I dare almost be positive that the Doctor's Thought was this: That St. *Austin*, having admitted that the Son was *God* by an *Act* of the Father's *Will*, and being press'd with the difficulty arising from that Supposition, had no way of coming off, but by asking, whether the Father *Himself* was not *God* by his own *Will*. If this was not the Doctor's Thought, it is at least what his Readers, very probably, will have, upon the reading the Doctor's Note. But to clear up this Matter, I'll tell you the whole Case. The *Arians*, formerly, as well as now, being very desirous to make a *Creature* of God the Son, set their Wits to work to find Arguments for it. They had a great mind to bring the *Catholicks* to admit that the Son was first produced, or generated, by an *Act* of the Father's *Will* (in the Sense of *free Choice*) and the Consequence They intended from it, was, that the Son was a *Creature*. The *Catholicks* would not admit their *Postulatum* without Proof; and so the *Arians* attempted to prove it thus, by a *Dilemma*. The Father begat his Son, either *Nolens*, or *Volens*; *against* his Will, or *with* his

his Will: It could not be *againſt* his Will, that is abſurd; therefore it muſt be with his *Will*; therefore that *Act* of the Will was precedent to the Son's Exiſtence, and the Father *prior* to the Son. Here the Doctor may ſee, who the Men were that firſt *confounded* two diſtinct Things, *mere Approbation*, and an *Act* of the *Will:* Not the acute St. *Auſtin*, not the *Catholicks*; but the *Arians*. To proceed: The **Catholicks*, particularly *Athanaſius*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, and St. *Auſtin* (Men of excellent Senſe, and who knew how to talk pertinently) eaſily contrived to baffle their Adverſaries with their own Weapons. Tell us, ſay They to the *Arians*, whether the *Father* be *God*, *Nolens*, or *Volens*; *againſt his Will*, *or with his Will*. This quite confounded the Men, and their *Dilemma*; and They had not a word to ſay more. For, if They had ſaid *Nolens*, *againſt his Will*; that was manifeſtly abſurd: If They had ſaid *Volens*, *with his Will*; then, by their own Argument, They made the Father *prior* to Himſelf. The Doctor perhaps might have help'd Them out. Let us ſee then: *The Anſwer*, He ſays, *is clear*. But what is *clear*? Does He imagine there was any difficulty in anſwering St. *Auſtin*'s Queſtion, taken by it ſelf? This required no *Oedipus*; Any Man might readily anſwer it: But the difficulty was for an *Arian* to make

* Athanaſ. Orat. 3. p. 619, 611. Gregory Nazianz. Orat. 35. p. 565, 566. Cyrill. Alexandr. Theſaur. p. 50, 52. Auguſt. Tom. 8. p. 626. 994. Ed. Bened.

an

an Answer, which should not recoil upon Himself. Let us take the Doctor's Answer, and observe whether it could be of use. *The Father*, says He, *is God with the Approbation of his Will* (Volens) *not by an Act of his Will*. Very good: But if an *Arian* formerly had thus answer'd St. *Austin*, it would have made the good *Father* smile. For, He would immediately have replied: Well then; so the Father had his Son (Volens) *by the Approbation of his Will*, and not by an *Act* of his *Will*: And now what becomes of your *Dilemma*, and your *Nolens Volens?* What could the *Arian* have pretended farther, except it were to persist in it, that the Son was *God* by an *Act* of the *Will*? To which it would be readily answer'd, that this was begging the Question; and so the whole must have ended. Judge you now, whether the Doctor or St. *Austin* had the greater *Acumen* in this Matter; and which of them is most apt to be *very unfair*, and to *confound* distinct Things.

FINIS.

Our eyes shall see Jerusalem a
quiet habitation a Tabernacle
that shall not be taken down,
not one of the stakes thereof
shall be removed neither shall
any of the cords be broken. Is. xxxiv.
Let us leave the deep things of God to God alone